BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1849. No. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

DOES THE SOUL OUT-LIVE THE BODY?

REPLY TO J. T. WALSH.

My Dear Sir,—Though I find not a few misapprehensions of my views in your last, I am disposed to pass them, and dismiss the philosophical questions, and come directly to this question, in the light of the Bible:

Does the soul, or mind of man, exist in a conscious state, after the death of the body, till the resurrection?

This is a plain question, and I suppose we are fairly at issue upon it. In your last, you admit, that man possesses no such "*substance*," or "*entity*," as mind, to which we can refer mental and moral phenomena, *distinct* from the body; and of course, the death, or dissolution of the body, involves, by a necessity which Omnipotence cannot avert, the end, or cessation of consciousness and thought, till the body is reorganized. This I deny, and join issue.

I referred, simply, to the fact that man was created in the image of God. This has drawn forth from you such a criticism, as makes it necessary for me to refer to your views, and press that argument upon your notice.

You define *Elohim* "holy ones, or *angels*," and hence declare, that man was created in the image of *angels!* This new criticism and theology, stand or fall together. I will, at this time, attempt no further refutation than to put your definition in the place of the word defined, in Gen. 1: 1—"In the beginning, Elohim (holy ones, or *angels*,) created the heaven and the earth."

I dismiss this point till you more fully develop your views, and hasten to press the argument.

Man was *created* in the image of God—Gen. 1: 26, "And God said, let us make man in our image, and after our likeness." 1: 27—"So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of *God* created he him." Gen. 9: 6—"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the *image of God* created he man." These passages, so plain that comment darkens them, fully sustain the position taken.

That it was the *nature* of man that was in the image of God, and not moral character, is clear; first, because moral character cannot be created; and secondly, because fallen and sinful man is *still* the image of God. Gen. 9: 6.

God being "a spirit," neither living nor lifeless, organized or unorganized *matter*, can be in the image or likeness of a spirit God. Here, leaving this matter, introduced into the discussion at this point, by mere chance, I proceed to the passage already introduced from Matt. 10: 28—"And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

I find nothing in your remarks upon this passage that I care to notice; you leave all I have said untouched.

1. Let the candid reader carefully observe, that soul is not put in contrast with life, but body; and therefore means that conscious, thinking part of man sometimes called mind.

If man has no soul distinct from the body, this text can never be made to harmonize with truth.

"Body" has a definite meaning, and can we believe "soul" to refer to nothing now positively existing, but to the *future* life of the *body*? 2. The soul is spoken of as now existing, and while man can "kill the body," it is declared he "cannot kill the soul."

Did Christ mean to say, fear not them that can kill the body in the present existence, but cannot kill the *body* in the future? 3. The distinction is kept up in the last clause of the passage—"but rather fear him who can destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell." If by *soul* here, we are not to understand any part of man's nature, now existing, but his future being after the resurrection, then, by *body*, we are to understand *present* existence, and not his physical nature; and then the text would read, "fear him who is able to destroy both the future life and the present life in hell."

4. But the absurdity of this, appears from the consideration, that to "destroy in hell," and "cast "into hell," are parallel phrases, and refer to a punishment after death; and as the death of the body is the destruction of the *present* life, the future and present life cannot both be destroyed in hell, as that would imply the destruction of what was already destroyed.

Notwithstanding your *denial*, I reaffirm that Christ declares the spirit to be born again, and not the flesh. The controversy is not about the *nature* of the change, but upon what is it wrought—flesh or spirit?

2 Cor. 12: 2, 3—Paul here declares, he knew a *man* caught up to the third heavens, but whether in the body, or out of the body, he could not tell. Now he does not call the body the man, for while that which constitutes the *true* man was carried to heaven, the body might not have been.

And he clearly indicates, that what he calls the *man* may leave the body, and exist out of it.

2 Cor. 5: 1—"For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The body is called a house, in which the true man, viz. the soul resides, and is contrasted with the residence of the soul after the dissolution of the body. This is

earthly, that heavenly; this perishing—'made with hands,'—that eternal."

Also the 6th and 8th: "Therefore, we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home, in the body, we are absent from the Lord."

"We are confident, *I say*, and willing rather to be *absent* from the *body*, and present with the Lord."

I hardly know how to give more clearness and force to these passages. Still the figure is kept up. The body is still regarded as the "house," or residence of the soul—the person proper, which implies absence from God. But Paul contemplates with joy, "absence from the body"—that "this earthly house" should be dissolved, for then he should be *present* with the Lord. In another place he contemplates death with delight, because *when* DEAD—as to the body—when it was "*dissolved*," he would "be with Christ."

Paul regarded dying as a departure to Christ, and and hence to be desired, above life. To leave *this* body, to have it dissolved, was only to enter into a heavenly residence—to be present with God. Such were his glorious hopes. Such are mine.

"Death is the gate to endless joy," with heaven opening on my eyes:—the music of angels sounding in my ears, "I mount, I fly; O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Respectfully,
WM. H. BREWSTER.

REPLY TO MR. BREWSTER.

Dear Sir: I am pleased to see, that as this discussion progresses, it increases in interest; and I hope our readers may all be edified in its perusal.

In your last, you state the following question for discussion: "*Does the soul, or mind of man, exist in a conscious state, after the death of the body, till the resurrection?*"

In reference to this you say, "I suppose we are fairly at issue." Yes, sir, upon this question, "we are fairly" and fully "at issue." You *affirm*, and I *deny*. And now to your arguments.

1. In my last response, I stated that man was made in the image of the Elohim, whom I defined to be the holy ones, or angels. This you characterize as a "new criticism and theology." Be it so; the *truth* contained in it, is as old as the creation of man. This I shall prove, during this discussion, if necessary. It being, however, in itself, a digression, I shall only give it this passing notice at present.

But, I affirm that man was not made in the image of "the invisible God." And you say, this image was "not moral character," but "the *nature* of man."

Now, for the sake of argument, I will suppose that "man was created in the image" of him, "who dwells in light inaccessible;" and that this image was a similarity of "*natures*." What then is the consequence? What was the "*nature*" of man? for, upon a solution of this question, depends the consequence. The "nature" of man is organized: *Ergo:* God is organized. The "nature" of man is compound: *Ergo:* God is compound. The "nature" of man, according to *your theory*, is *mortal* and *immortal: Ergo:* God is *mortal* and *immortal!* Thus it is reduced to an absurdity.

Elohim is a name not only bestowed on angels, but also on orders of men. See Psalm xcvii. 7. Heb. i. 6. Psalm viii. 5. Ps. lxxxii. 6. But, as I stated, I shall reserve my arguments on this point, to a future time.

Man was created in the "image" or "likeness" —*form*—of the Elohim. Angels, or the Elohim, have appeared to men, and were found to be "in fashion as men;" not so with him "who dwells in light inaccessible, whom no man hath seen, nor can see."

You say, "God," (the Everlasting Father,) "being a spirit, neither living nor lifeless, organized or unorganized *matter*, can be in the image or likeness of a spirit—God." This is true; but it is not true in reference to the Elohim.

2. Upon my remarks on Matthew x. 28, you say, "I find nothing I *care* to notice." Perhaps you might not "care" to notice an argument? But, be this as it may, I will now try and give you something which you will "care to notice."

In my remarks on the passage referred to, I observed that the word translated "kill," in the first instance used, signified to "murder," "to put to death" with an evil purpose. Well, Jesus says, "Fear not them who 'murder' the body, but are not able to 'murder' the soul." And what is the reason they "are not able to 'murder,' 'dismiss,' or 'extinguish' the 'soul,' or life?" Before giving the answer, I will remark, that the term soul, (*Psyche*) means breath, life, principle of life, &c., and that it is used with reference to the life to come, as we shall presently see. Why, then, I ask again, could they not "murder," or "extinguish" the *Psyche?*

1st. Because it was an *attribute*, and not an *entity*, as Mr. B. supposes. Attributes are not said to be "murdered."

2d. Because Jesus is "the *resurrection* and the *life;* the *prince* and *author* of *life;*" and inasmuch as the "life" of his disciples is "hid with him in God," they could not "dismiss them from life," in the sense of not living again.

3. The word "destroy," in this passage, is not the same in the original, where it is rendered "kill." This word "destroy," is used in reference to both "body" and "soul;" that is, the "body," and its *attribute* "life." God can "extinguish" both in *gehenna*, in the sense of the "second death"—a "death ending in death," as Paul expresses it.

In further proof of the correctness of this exposition, at the 39th verse, in the same chapter, and in the same connection, and in the same discourse, we have the following: "He that findeth (saveth) his life, (*Psyche*) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life (*Psyche*) for my sake, shall find (save) it."

Here we are taught that those who, for the sake of their lives, rejected, or denied the Messiah, "shall lose it." Lose what? Lose the *Psyche*—life. They save it here, but lose it in the age to come, by a "second death." While, on the other hand, those who "lose the life," or *Psyche*, in the present age, for "Christ's sake," shall "find," or save it in the future age, by a resurrection to eternal life.

I have more than fifty proofs of this interpretation, but for the want of room, must not introduce them. They will be presented in the course of this discussion.

3. I shall give your *re*-affirmation, concerning the new birth, the go by; because that is not *the* subject of discussion, but a digression from it. I am satisfied the change is wrought upon the *man*.

4th. You base an argument on Paul's vision, found in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, 4. I will now examine it.

Paul says, "I will come to *visions* and *revelations* of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth.) Such an one caught up (or away) to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth,) that he was caught up (away) to Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful (possible) to utter."

On this I remark:

1. That Paul calls it a "*vision*." What is a "vision?" It is a *supernatural representation of future things*. Paul received "revelations.

2. Paul did not know the state he was in at the time, and intimates that God only knew; but our opponents will have it that *they know*, and confidently tell us he was "out of his body!"

3. James tells us, "that the body, without the spirit, is dead;" therefore, if Paul was "out of his body," in a literal sense, his body was dead!

4. Paul was caught away, as the word should be rendered, to the third heaven—to Paradise, which is to be displayed on the earth, during the age to come. He had "visions and revelations" of the future.

5. I conceive the meaning of the apostle to be, that he did not know whether he was literally, or bodily caught away, as Philip was when found at Azotus; or whether he was mentally caught away. That God only could tell whether he was really caught away, or whether he was abstracted, absorbed, enraptured, and caught, or carried away by the things presented to him.

In Rev. iv. 5, John says: "After this I looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven; and the first voice I heard, was as it were of a trumpet talking with me, which said, come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit," &c. Does any one suppose that John really went up to heaven? No: so far from it, he received those revelations "in the isle that is called Patmos;" but when the angel said "come up hither," he was "immediately in the spirit," and was doubtless caught away as Paul was. He was so filled with the spirit of God, as to be totally taken up, and absorbed by the scenes before him—the things he saw and heard. He was wrapt in visions of the future, wrought up into an exstacy, enraptured and ravished by the things presented to him. I have already referred to the case of Philip, as an instance of being bodily caught away. The case of Ezekiel is another. But in the case of Paul, he did not know whether he was thus bodily caught away, or whether it was mental.

6. Your next proof is 2 Cor. v. 1, &c. I will proceed to analyze it.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God; a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" This verse stands related to the last verse of the preceding chapter, where Paul contrasts "things seen and unseen, temporal and eternal." And then, speaking of those "temporal" things, which constitute our "earthly house of *dwelling*," he says, "if this tabernacle were *dissolved*," as Peter taught it would be, "we have a *building* of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Not beyond the skies, but in the "new heavens and earth." A "city whose builder and maker is God;" for which Abraham, and all those ancient worthies looked.

"For in this" dwelling place, "we *groan* earnestly, desiring to be clothed," or invested, "with our house," or building, "which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed," invested, "we shall not be found naked," or destitute.

This "house," "building," dwelling place, or "tabernacle," is said to be "from heaven," just as the New Jerusalem is said to be; and because every "good gift comes from above."

"For we that are in this tabernacle," or dwelling place, "do *groan*, being burdened: not because we would be unclothed," naked, or destitute, "but clothed," or invested with an "eternal" dwelling place, "a building of God," "not made with" human "hands"—"that *mortality* might be swallowed up by life."

In Rom. viii. 22, 23, Paul speaks of this "*groaning*," and "waiting for the adoption—the redemption," or resurrection "of the body." Now Paul did not wish to be "unclothed," "naked," or destitute; but he wished to be invested with that "tabernacle," or dwelling place, into which he would be introduced when "mortality is swallowed up by life."

"Now," says he, "he that hath wrought us for this same thing," a resurrection to life, "is God, who also hath given to us the earnest of the spirit." "Therefore," because we have the "earnest of the spirit," we are always confident; knowing that, while we are at home in the "*mortal*" body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight.) We are confident, I say, and willing, rather to be absent from the "*mortal* body," in the sense of having it "swallowed up by life," "and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour, that whether present" with the Lord, "or absent" from him, "we may be accepted by him," when he shall come. "*For* we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *in body*, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad." If the reader will keep in mind the two important points in this quotation, viz.: *the resurrection and judgment;* together with the fact, that "*we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ;* THAT," *or in order that* "*every one may receive* IN BODY, *according to what he hath done, whether good or bad,*" he will be able to understand and appreciate our view. There are no rewards between death and the resurrection. Rewards are to be received "in body," after an "appearance at the judgment seat of Christ."

7. Your final proof is a reference to Philippians 1: 20, 21, 22, 23, 24.

In this chapter Paul is speaking of "his bonds," and "the things which happened to" him, which he tells the Philippians had "fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel." He then adverts to the fact, that "some indeed preach Christ, even from envy and strife," "supposing to add affliction to my bonds." But, "notwithstanding," says he, "I therein rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. For I know that this will turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, *Christ*

will be magnified in my body, whether by life, or by death." This is one *point*, to which special attention will be called.

"For to me to live is Christ,"—Christ will be "magnified" if I live—"and to die is gain," not to me personally, *but to "Christ;"* "the gospel will be furthered thereby;" "Christ will be magnified by my death." But if I live in the *flesh*"—this mortal state, "*this* is the *fruit* of my labour," "bonds and imprisonments await me,"—"yet what I shall choose I know not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, *having*" AN EARNEST DESIRE FOR THE RETURNING *and being with Christ.* "Paul did not write the words imputed to him" in the common version. "He did not pen the sentiment attributed to him. The advocate of immortal-soulism would never have appealed to this text, if it had been faithfully translated. His words are, *teen apithumian echoon eis to analusai, kai sun Christo einai*—having an earnest desire *for the returning* and being with Christ." This criticism is not original with me, but I adopt it as my own, on account of its superiority over every other interpretation. The same word, *analusai*, in Luke xii. 36, is properly rendered *return*, in connection with the same topic Paul was discoursing on.

Thus I have fully and "fairly" met all your arguments, and our readers must judge of its merits.

8. You mistake the "hope" of Paul. His hope had reference to his Lord's "*returning*," at which time he expected to be invested with a "crown." I am sorry your "hope" differs from his. You raise a shout of "victory" by far too soon! "Death is" *not* "the gate to endless joy," but rather "the gate" to *hades—sheol*—the grave—the house appointed for the living. When we die, death gains a *temporary* "victory;" hence I said, you raised the shout of "victory" too soon. Read the 15th Cor. and you will see, that the time when this shout of victory will be raised is when the "dead shall be raised incorruptible," at the "returning" of the Lord Jesus from heaven. And the prophets teach the same doctrine.

"Heaven" does not "open on" the "eyes" at death; but the "eyes" are shut, closed, sealed to all the universe, and "the music of angels" does not "sound" in the "ears" of the *dead!* There is no "mounting," nor "flying," when men descend into the grave! No, my good sir, there is no shout of victory then; but all is sadness, weeping, mourning, and lamentation on the part of the living; and corruption, death, silence and darkness on the part of the dead.

My good sir, let me urge you to fix your hopes on the *resurrection* from the dead, instead of placing them at the *gloomy point* of death! The Lord will soon be here; he brings "his rewards with him;" O! let us fix our hopes upon that glorious event: "for, to them that look for him, he will appear the second time, without a sin offering, in order to salvation." May you and I stand undismayed in his presence, is the prayer of your friend, and obedient servant, J. T. WALSH.

TO CORRESPONDENTS AND FRIENDS.—The crowded state of our columns, compels us to lay over nearly all the letters, questions, &c., we have received, besides the greater part of our own scriblings. We intended to give one, in this number, "On the Perfection of Adam, or his Holiness and Knowledge." Br. Walsh's "Scriptural Psychology, No. 2," is also crowded out.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

BY RICHARD WHATELY, D. D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

LECTURE III.

Reasons for supposing the Intermediate State one of Consciousness.

It appears to have been a belief or suspicion entertained by several of the earliest Christians that the end of the world was just at hand; which opinion was probably founded on a misinterpretation of our Lord's prophecies respecting the judgment about to be executed on Jerusalem, which, in a certain sense, was called "the coming of the Lord;" and which "coming" they confounded with his final coming to judge the world; a mistake the more natural, because He himself did at the same time prophesy concerning his final coming likewise; so that what related to the one and to the other of these two events, was in some degree mixed and blended together.*

The Thessalonians, moreover, seem to have had an idea, that some advantages would be possessed by those of them who should be alive at the coming of Jesus Christ, over those who had died before it; and that these would be admitted to some higher privileges; which of course increased their sorrow for their friends who were departed. This occasioned the Apostle Paul to assure them, that all Christians who had continued in the faith and fear of God, should be partakers of the same blessings, whether they should be living or dead, when the day of judgment should arrive, and should enter upon the enjoyment of those blessings at the very same time; that those "who are alive shall not prevent" (that is, precede or be beforehand with) those of the faithful who are in the grave; but that "the dead in Christ shall rise first;" that is, the *first thing* in order of time will be, that the *dead* in Christ shall rise, and shall be admitted into the presence of the Lord, together with those that are still living.

This is sufficient to afford comfort to all who have a lively faith in God's promises; both of the Thessalonians and of all other Christians in every age and country: with this the Apostle is contented; it being generally the practice of the Sacred Writers to reveal that the most distinctly which it is of the greatest practical importance to know; and to speak less frequently and more obscurely of matters, on which, however interesting to our curiosity, we may safely remain in ignorance or in doubt, during our time of trial here on earth.

The Apostle accordingly, though he has said enough to encourage his disciples not to sorrow as men without hope for their deceased brethren, gives no account of the intermediate state which was alluded to in my last Lecture; that state, in which men remain from death till the final resurrection. He merely tells them, that as "Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."

And this (the intermediate state) is a point on which, I think nothing is so clearly revealed in any part of Scripture, as to allow us to pronounce positively that such and such a belief respecting it is

*See Hinds's "History of the Rise and Early Progress of Christianity," for some remarks on the prophecies of our Lord; and also his "Catechist's Manual," on the same subject.

to be held as an essential part of the Christian faith; since, if such had been the design of the Almighty, I cannot but think there would have been some explicit and decisive revelation given on that point.

One thing, however, (I remarked to you) is perfectly clear and certain respecting what that intermediate state *is not;* namely, that it is *not* a state of trial and probation,—a state in which anything can take place (through any prayers or pretended sacrifices offered up by survivors) to affect a man's final condition; since we are plainly taught in Scriptures that this present life is the *whole* of our state of trial, and that we shall be judged at the last day according to our conduct here on earth.

Since, then, the intermediate state is not one of trial, it must be either one of enjoyment and suffering according to each man's character (that is, a state of reward and punishment,) or else a state of utter insensibility and unconsciousness; either of which opinions may, I think, be safely entertained (though only one of them can be true,) without failing in any part of the faith which it is essential for a Christian to hold.

It may be interesting, however, to lay before you some of the reasons which are urged in behalf of each of these opinions; that you may be prepared to do justice to the maintainers both of the one and the other, and that you may perceive how perfectly each supposition accords with what are the essential parts of our faith on this point; namely, a due sense of the immense value of this life considered as a preparation for eternity,—and the fullest confidence in the promises and threatenings of God with respect to the life to come.

Those then, who believe that the soul, when separated from the body by death, retains its activity, and consciousness, and sensibility to pleasure and pain, and that it enters immediately on a state of enjoyment or of suffering, appeal to several passages of Scripture, which appear to favour this doctrine, though without expressly declaring it: among which is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus; the former of whom is represented as being in a state of torment: although the end of the world is plainly supposed not to have arrived, since he is described as entreating Lazarus to warn his surviving brethren, "lest they also come into this place of torment." And if all that is here told were to be considered as a narrative of a matter of fact which actually took place, it would be perfectly decisive. But all allow that the narrative is a *parable*, that is, a fictitious tale framed in order to teach or illustrate some doctrine: and although such a tale *may* chance to agree in every point with matter of fact,—with events which actually take place,—there is no necessity that it should. The only truth that is essential in a parable, is the truth of the moral or doctrine conveyed by it. Many accordingly of our Lord's parables are not, although many are, exactly correspondent with facts which actually occur. For instance, in the parable of the sower, the account of the different success of the seed which fell on the trodden wayside, in the rocky ground, among thorns, and on good land, agrees literally with what actually takes place daily; though no particular sower is intended, even here: the object is to illustrate the different reception of the gospel by men of different characters. On the other hand, in the parable of the good Samaritan,—in that of the king who destroyed the ungrateful guests who refused to come to his feast,—of the husbandmen who killed the servants and the son of the lord of the vineyard,—and in many others,—there is no reason to believe that any such events did ever actually take place; it is enough for the object of the parable, that it is *conceivable* they *might* take place; and that we should be able to derive instruction from considering how men *would be likely* to act, or how they *ought* to act, *supposing* such circumstances *should* actually occur.

The parable therefore of the rich man and Lazarus, is not, I think, decisive of the point in question. It seems to imply, indeed, very plainly, that there is a future state of reward and punishment (a doctrine however, which most of Christ's hearers had no doubt of;) and also that those who have been devoted to the good things and enjoyments of this world, will have no share in those of the world to come, and will regret, when it is too late, their not having "laid up for themselves treasure in heaven."* This appears to have been the general moral design of the parable; in the detail of which, many things are spoken figuratively, to give force and liveliness to the description, which are plain enough *when figuratively* understood, but could not have been meant, of course, to be taken literally; as, for instance, when the rich man is represented as holding discourse with Abraham, and entreating a drop of water to cool his tongue, because he is tormented in flames: which is a lively figurative description of the future misery of the wicked, and is so employed by our Lord in other places: all of which corresponds exactly with what *would* be said and done *supposing* such circumstances actually and literally to occur; but does not imply that the fact is literally such as the parable describes. Indeed, the very circumstance of the torturing *flames*, implies, literally, the presence of the *body;* and therefore cannot be literally true of a state in which the soul is *separate* from the body.

It may be said that as our Lord must have known what is the actual state of the departed, He might have been expected on such an occasion as this, to reveal it. That He did not, however, in fact, give a literally true account of this state, is plain from what has been just said: nor does it appear to have been his design, generally, to reveal all that He was able to reveal.

The same view, I think, may be taken of the vision presented to the Apostle John (in the Revelations) of the souls of those who had suffered martyrdom for the Christian faith, calling upon God to avenge his Church, even as the blood of Abel is said, in Genesis, to cry to the Lord. We may collect from this, that a notice was intended to be given to John of the severe and bloody persecutions of the Christians, which took place not very long after,—and an assurance that God would give deliverance to His Church, and that those who had suffered in the cause of Christ should be highly exalted and everlastingly rewarded by Him. But many of the circumstances of the vision are evi-

*It has been supposed, and I have no doubt with reason, that there is also another meaning, more appropriate to the Gospel-scheme, in this parable: that the rich man represents the Jews, originally God's "peculiar people," and Lazarus, the despised Gentiles, who were afterwards admitted to "sit down with *Abraham*, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." This however does not concern the present question.

dently such as can only be understood figuratively; such as the *white robes* of the martyrs, which denote their being justified and accounted pure before God through the blood of Christ. So that I think we cannot from this passage conclude with any certainty that these martyrs, or any other Christians, enter into a state of reward or punishment immediately after death. Indeed, if it were but recollected that nothing but *material, bodily,* substance can be an object of *sight*, it would be plain that all the passages in which a departed soul is spoken of as *appearing to the eyes*, so far from proving even the existence of the soul in a *separate* state from the body, and unconnected with any material substance, would, if they were to be understood literally, prove the direct contrary,—that the persons so spoken of as visibly appearing, actually *had* bodies at the time.*

Again, the transfiguration on the mount, in which Moses and Elias appear talking with Jesus, may be brought forward as an argument for the supposition of a state of sense and consciousness after death before the final resurrection; Moses and Elias having been dead long before. But nothing generally decisive can be concluded from any case which is manifestly an *exception* to general rules; as this was, in every respect. The prophet Elijah (or Elias,) we know, did not die at all; but was visibly, in his bodily state, taken from the earth; and in the case of Moses also, a prophet still more highly favoured of God, there appears to have been something peculiar as to his departure; for we are told indeed that he died, and was buried in the land of Moab, but that "*no man knew of his sepulchre.*" Whether he also, like Elijah, and like Enoch, was permitted to forstall the general resursection, we cannot tell; but it seems clear (as I lately observed to you) that the soul separate from the body is not an object of *sight*, (since, at a man's death, all that was formerly visible of him, remains before our eyes in the corpse;) so that nothing can be inferred respecting a *separate* state of the soul, from the *visible* appearance of Moses and Elias, which the eyes of the Apostles witnessed.

It is to be observed also, that there can be little doubt the appearance of Moses and Elias on this occasion was designed to represent "the law" (delivered by Moses) "and the prophets," of whom Elias was especially venerated; and that their appearing in friendly communing with Jesus, denoted the agreement of his Gospel with the Law and the Prophets, which He "came not to destroy, but to fulfil." This was the lesson which the appearance conveyed to the disciples; and the *appearance* alone is all that concerned them, or that concerns us. The actual condition of the persons themselves, is a point which did not concern them. Every thing, indeed, that is recorded in the Gospel-history, is to be considered in reference to the *instruction* it was designed to convey to the disciples: "this voice," said our Lord (of that which then came from heaven, announcing Him as the "Beloved Son of God,") "came not because of me, but for *your* sakes."

The promise of our Lord to the thief on the Cross, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," has been urged with more reason, in favour of the opinion that man passes from death at once into a state of enjoyment or of suffering. But this also is a very peculiar case; and therefore can hardly be regarded as decisive as to what shall be the lot of other men. I mean, supposing the promise to be understood in the literal sense of the word *to-day*; which as I shall show hereafter, is not absolutely necessary. I shall dwell at large in another Lecture (the 11th) on the remarkable circumstances (often overlooked) which made the dying thief's profession of faith most distinguished and eminent;—his acknowledging as his *King, that* Jesus who was at the very moment expiring on the Cross, when all his own disciples had fled in despair; his being the *first*, probably, who ever perceived and acknowledged the true nature of Christ's kingdom, as being one into which He should enter *by suffering;*—his being the *only* one who ever did confess this faith before the resurrection. *His* faith, therefore, was most peculiar and pre-eminent. And so also was the period of his death, at the very time of the mighty sacrifice of the Son of God; which was accompanied with many miraculous circumstances, and, among others, by the resurrection (as the Evangelists inform us) of the bodies of several holy men, who came out of their graves, and "entered into the holy city (Jerusalem) after the resurrection, and appeared unto many:" a kind of event which no one expects will take place with Christians in general before the day of judgment.

Whether the immediate admission into Paradise* of the penitent thief, supposing this to be under-

*It is remarkable that a great part of mankind, and those not least, who profess to hold, not only the distinct nature of the soul from any material substance, but even its power of continuing active and conscious when disunited from matter, are nevertheless altogether *materialists*, and mean by a *spirit* only some thin and delicate kind of matter, like a cloud, or a ray of light, &c., which is an object of the senses, but not of *all* the senses. This is plainly the case, not only with those who believe in the common stories of ghosts (that is, spirits) *appearing* and speaking, but also with those who, though they disbelieve these accounts, yet perceive nothing *contradictory* and inconceivable in the idea of the *appearing of a spirit;* which of course would be to them mere words without meaning, if they understood by "spirit" something which does not consist of matter, and consequently cannot have (as a visible object must) shape, height, colour, &c.

Whatever is actually seen, or presented to any of the senses, whether naturally or supernaturally, must of course be material; but a like *effect* may be produced on the *mind* (as we experience in the case of imagination and dreaming, and, as we read, in the case of visions) without the presence (as far as we know) of any material object. And the inaccuracy of common anguage, when we are speaking of such things, perhaps tends to confuse our thoughts. Thus we say, indifferently, "I *saw* in my sleep this or that," or "I dreamed that I saw it:" the former expression, interpreted literally, would imply the presence of a material object; the latter, not.

*There was something remarkable and seemingly peculiar in the very promise itself which was made to this man. The full purport of it, we cannot, I think, positively determine. If the "Paradise," into which he was promised immediate admittance, be the place in which "just men made perfect," will, after the day of judgment, dwell for "ever with the Lord,"—or if it be the place or state into which good Christians pass immediately after death,—it is remarkable that the word Paradise is not the one commonly used in Scripture to convey either of those meanings.

stood literally, is to be regarded as one of the miraculous and extraordinary circumstances of that awful period, and consequently different from what takes place in other cases, or whether the same will be the lot of all Christ's faithful servants immediately on their departing this life, we are not, I think, authorized by that portion of the sacred history positively to pronounce. (See note A. at the end of this Lecture.)

The passage in the first Epistle of Peter, about our Lord's "preaching to the spirits in prison," has been supposed to allude not only to the conscious state of departed spirits, but even to Christ's having visited, in the interval between his death and resurrection, the souls of those who perished in Noah's flood. But this seems to me a very unlikely interpretation. The passage is indeed extremely obscure; and I have seen no explanation of it that is free from objection; but I will subjoin that which seems to me the most probable. (See note B. at the end of this Lecture.)

I shall resume the consideration of the general question in a future Lecture; in which, though I may not be able to set before you anything decisively convincing and satisfactory as to the point now immediately before us (which is certainly interesting to our curiosity, though not essential to a saving faith,) yet I shall not have occupied your time unprofitably, if I shall but have drawn off your thoughts in any degree from the cares and concerns of the world in which we live; which being present, and the object of our senses, generally occupies far the greater part of our attention; though in comparison of that world to come, which can be viewed only with the eye of faith, it is but as a grain of sand placed beside a mountain; "For the things which are seen are *temporal*, but the things which *are not seen* are *eternal*."

Note A.—The passage (Matt. x: 28,) "fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul," &c., I had not adverted to, from not supposing it to have any connexion with the present subject; nor can I now perceive any; but as the learned Whitby, in his extreme anxiety to prove from Scriptures a separate state of consciousness, has in his Commentary so applied this text, it is due to such an authority briefly to mention it. He does not seem, however, to have written in this place with his usual judgment.

The expression of Jesus to his disciples was manifestly intended to remind them that their enemies could only inflict temporal death,—could only put an end to a man's life in this world; whereas God's power extends to the whole of our existence,—to all eternity:—in the next world as well as in this. The question about the intermediate condition between death and the resurrection, evidently was not at all in his mind. But Whitby imagines Him to imply that the soul never can be in an unconscious state, because then it would be killed; "for," says he, "'tis not easie to perceive how an intelligible, thinking, and perceiving Being can be more killed than by depriving it of all sensation, thought, and perception." He did not recollect that it is a thing of every day's occurrence for a man to receive, for instance, a stunning blow, which for some minutes deprives him of all sensation, &c., though he afterwards recovers; yet we should not say that the person inflicting such a blow had killed the other's soul, any more than to leave him in the dark for some time would be the same thing as to destroy his eyes. But Whitby does not in general reason in this manner.

Note B.—"By the power of which Divine Spirit of His, long before His manifestation in the flesh, he came to the old world; and by the mouth of Noah, that 'preacher of righteousness,' spake to them whose spirits are now fast prisoned in hell; which were in their lifetime wicked and disobedient to His holy counsels; when the patient long-suffering of God gave a large respite to them for their repentance and conversion, even all the while the ark was preparing by Noah."—*Bp. Hall.*

"'The spirits in prison,' to whom St. Peter saith, that Christ 'by His Spirit preached,' he saith also were those 'which were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.' And therefore Christ's 'preaching to them by His Spirit' probably means, His exciting by His Spirit, which 'strove' with them for a time, Gen. vi. 3, that patriarch to be 'a preacher of righteousness' among them, as the same Apostle in his other Epistle calls him, 2 Pet. ii. 5. But not hearkening to him *then*, they are *now* in prison, reserved for the sentence of the last day."—*Abp. Secker.*

"The plain interpretation of this passage is the true one, namely, that Christ did preach unto those men who lived before the flood even while they lived, and consequently that He was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if He personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a Prophet, by the sending of Noah, a 'preacher of righteousness;' yet to do anything by another, not able to perform it without Him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if He did it of Himself without any intervening instrument."—*Bp. Pearson.*

REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.—The Jews, both here and in Europe, are just now making great efforts to raise subscriptions for the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem—permission to that effect having recently been given them by the Turkish Government. The subject has been in agitation in this city, of late, and at the Hebrew Festival, the other evening, at the Coliseum, it was prominently discussed. Among the guests there, not mentioned in our report of proceedings, was a Greek Rabbi, who comes here specially commissioned to raise money for the enterprise in question; and we are told his errand, thus far, has been pretty liberally rewarded. The Rabbi goes, next, South, we are told, and, before going back to Europe, will visit the Eastern States. However chimerical this new movement may appear, we confess to us there seems a sublimity of purpose about it which must claim the respect at least, if not the sympathy, of all Christendom.—*N. Y. Express.*

JERUSALEM.—The number of Israelites having greatly increased in the holy city, they have been induced to enlarge and rebuild the Synagogue Beth El, and we have received an appeal from the chiefs of the congregation for aid.—*Occident.*

EUROPE.—The emancipation of the Jews in various States is progressing; though it had not yet been pronounced universally through Germany at late accounts. Several Jewish deputies were elected for the Austrian and Prussian Diets, in addition to those who were chosen for the German Parliament in Frankfort. Dr. Fishhoff was appointed President of the Austrian Diet, if we understand aright a paragraph in the Orient. The

celebrated preacher, Dr. Isaac Noah Mannheimer, of Vienna, is also a member; he sits for Brody in Gallicia, and was appointed Vice President at the first meeting of the house. Another delegate is Dr. Goldmark. A writer in the Orient remarks it as singular, that a Jew is President of an assembly in a city where a relative, should he come to see him, has to pay a personal Jew-tax for the privilege of sojourning there a few days. Such are some of the inconsistencies of the present state of Austria, which we hope may soon yield to more sensible counsels. In Berlin, Dr. Kosh and Dr. John Jacob are prominent members of the Diet, and the former had well nigh been appointed minister of public worship, only that the change from a total exclusion from all office to that of superintendent of Church affairs was too great, even in the democratic changes of the present year. But office-holding is no object, so only that no exclusion is permitted.—*Ibid.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JAN., 1849.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We present our monthly visitor once more before those who have furnished us the means: to others we should be glad to do it also; but our circumstances forbid it, and we submit. We doubt not our patrons will do the best they can to increase the number of our subscribers the present year. The five dollar shares, by which we were helped last year, have been pledged, this year, by only one or two out of this city: here some eight or ten have renewed their pledges. We will only say—we need all the help our friends can afford us.

All articles furnished by our *Associate* will bear his signature or initials. Each Editor is responsible for his own articles, and no more, unless he endorse them. We wish it distinctly understood, that inserting the article of a correspondent without note or comment is *not* endorsing it. All articles without a signature, not credited as *selected*, are from the pen of the senior Editor. Let these things be borne in mind and we shall not need to repeat them.

Those who receive this number of the Examiner will consider it a receipt in full for Vol. 4, unless they find in the margin a sum marked less than 50 cents: thus—25—signifies that 25 cents only are credited you for the present volume.

All letters should be directed—GEO. STORRS, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TO OUR READERS.—We wish you all a happy new year; and to that end, we hope you may grow in grace and in knowledge; but, especially that you may have a large increase of that *love* without which knowledge is vain, and will only aggravate our guilt before Him who so loved us as to send His Son to manifest that glorious attribute of his nature;—for, "God is Love:" and, "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." Love is the element in which the pure in heart dwell: it is the soil in which all other Christian graces grow and flourish, and without which no other trait of Christian character can be manifested. It must be like the love of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ. His was not a *party* love: it embraced friends and foes: it prayed for his murderers: it led him even to die for his enemies. It pre-eminently embraces now *all his church.* It is not a Methodist love—a Baptist love—a Presbyterian love—an Adventist's love;—but, it is the love of the *head* for *the body*—for *all* the body; not one member to the exclusion of any other member, but love of the whole: it was a love that bore the sins of the body—that made those sins his own—that suffered on account of them. If our love is like his, it will lead us to be like minded: never shall we rejoice at discovering sins or errors in our worst enemies; much more shall we not take pleasure in finding or spreading abroad the sins or faults of any who have named the name of Christ. Their sins are *our* sins—they are the sins of *the body* of Christ: and can one member sin or suffer and not the whole body partake with it? We believe not: and we mourn that a more lively sense of this truth has not always pressed upon our mind as we now see it. Oh, that the conductors of this paper and all its readers may be filled with that love which filled the Saviour's heart—then will it be a happy year, indeed. We shall contend earnestly for what we believe is truth on all subjects that come before us; especially on that of *no life—no immortality* but IN *Christ:* and we shall do it, because, we believe no *one* subject is more calculated to honor Christ, and manifest the love of God; which manifestation is vastly important to draw out love to God and men, and give it permanence in our minds.

THE LIKENESS AND SKETCH OF BR. WALSH, in this number of the Examiner, have been furnished by our request, and without employing any of the funds of the Examiner for the object. It may seem strange that we have never seen our Associate Editor, but such is the fact. We thought our readers might be pleased, as well as ourself, to see something of the kind we now furnish through the agency of a friend of Br. Walsh. A wood cut likeness is always, at best, imperfect, as it cannot give the shade of the countenance. We take pleasure in saying, that we think no man can execute engraving on wood better than Mr. Mumford, of this city, who executed that from which the impression before us is made, from a Daguerreotype likeness.

A SKETCH, &c.

Mr. J. T. Walsh, the subject of this sketch, was born in Hanover County, Va., on the 15th of February, 1815, consequently he is now in the 34th year of his age. His parents were Methodists, and he was trained up in the doctrines peculiar to that denomination. At the age of 18 he united himself to that church, and very soon commenced public speaking. Being possessed, however, of an enquiring mind, he soon discovered not only the incorrectness of his religious faith, but, also, his practice. He, therefore, demanded baptism at the hand of a Baptist minister, and was accordingly immersed. Subsequently to this, he became identified with the *Reform-Baptists*, better known as "*Reformers*." He was afterwards expelled from this church, for holding the sentiments he now advocates. He positively refused to hold them in abeyance. In 1843 a work by Geo. Storrs, entitled "*An Enquiry: Are the Wicked Immortal?*" fell into his hands, and, *for the first time*, his attention was directed to the question of IMMORTALITY. This gave a new direction to his enquiries, which resulted, as I have already stated, in his expulsion from Mr. Campbell's communion, and the occupying of his *present* POSITION. Mr. Walsh has been steadily advancing in Biblical knowledge. Being nurtured in the school of adversity, he has learned "*to suffer and be quiet*," as Longfellow expresses it.

I here take the liberty of introducing some remarks by Dr. Wooster, descriptive of Mr. Walsh. He says: "Our attention is first directed to a monstrous large brain, mounted on a pedestal of moderate size, but sound and elastic in every particular; having, constitutionally, good digestive, respiratory, and circulatory systems." Again he says: "His mind will have an endless variety of exercises, many of which will never see the light, as it is of such an order as will not be idle. His principles are liberal in every particular, not swayed by any thing but *reason*: and no matter how dearly and long cherished, he will listen to the voice of reason and change his views just so often as he can change them for the *better*; and always be ready to render a reason for the hope that is in him. He will adopt *no* ridiculous dogmas, to please the multitude, but be governed by his own judgment in all he can investigate."

Again, speaking of him as an Editor, he says: "He is adapted by nature to his business: as a writer, he will be racy, unequivocal, and bold; expressing his sentiments in a comprehensible and comprehensive manner; condensing the pith of his subject to the smallest compass, but, at the same time, not obscuring the sense from his readers. He will excel in examining and explaining "*what is*;" in meeting sophistry with reasoning, in dispelling error and presenting truth. Mr. Walsh is a good *listener*; comprehends remarkably quick, and dilates upon the subject at once with feeling and cogency. His mind is clear, comprehensive, and able to grapple with the most abstruse subjects; and to mature them well, and give them out satisfactorily. He is fond of polemics, and always ready for a tilt with a reputable competitor; and he has the faculty of meeting arguments without dismay, and giving the triumph of reason. He would sooner encounter a storm, than endure the monotony of a calm."

Thus much it was deemed necessary to say, as an accompaniment of Mr. Walsh's likeness; both of which have been furnished by special request for the Bible Examiner. W. M. W.

State of the Dead.—End of the Wicked.—Since the close of our last volume, we have received several new works from England. We have heard it intimated that no *Trinitarian* held the views on the final destiny of the ungodly that we advocate. The works we have received abundantly disprove this; for *Dobney* is a Trinitarian; so is Bishop Whately, whose "Scripture Revelations on a Future State" is among the works above named, and from which we give a "Chapter" in this number of the Examiner. "Edward White, minister of the Congregational Church," is also a Trinitarian. His "Life in Christ;" or "Immortality is the Peculiar Privilege of the Regenerate"—"Being the substance of Lectures delivered at Hereford, in the year 1845," is among the valuable works we have just received. This work contains much valuable matter, from which we intend to draw largely for our columns. "Reginald Courtenay, M. A., Rector of Thornton Watlass, Yorkshire," is likewise a Trinitarian. His work on "The Future State, their Evidences and Nature considered on Principles

Physical, Moral and Scriptural," is a production of much value, so far as we have examined it. He maintains the unconscious state of *souls* after death, in a masterly manner.

We commence our extracts from these writings in this number of the Examiner, viz. from Dobney and Bishop Whately, with the design of continuing them in future numbers. It will be seen, in the course of the extracts, that these writers consider the intermediate state as one about which the Scriptures are not decisive; but both of them evidently favour the idea of its being one of unconsciousness. It is for the friends of these truths to say whether they shall be widely scattered by the Examiner; and the number of new paying subscribers you send us must determine that soon, as we shall only print a limited number, unless ordered immediately.

An Apology.—In noticing the "Lectures of J. W. Bonham, on the Eternal Punishment of the Wicked not Annihilation," in one of the last Examiners, we used the following expression:—"We may give our readers a specimen of the double-faced character of that *abortion*." We intended nothing disrespectful of *Br. Bonham*. Our remark was designed to apply simply to the *work;* still, we did not express ourself as cautiously as we ought to have done. We should have been contented in saying,—"In our mind, the lectures are a most singular failure," and *contradictory in themselves.*

THE AGES—NO. I.

Was the Flood Universal?

In the presentation of this subject, I may, perchance, tread upon unexplored territory; and, in the estimation of some, advance some very novel views: but I trust they will be weighed in the light of God's testimony, and then, if found wanting, let them be rejected; but if found to accord with reason and revelation, let them be received. Now to our subject.

We pass over the *Adamic age*, if it may be so called, and attend to an event which marked the *patriarchal age*, viz. the flood. Our reason for introducing this question, is the use made of it by the apostle Peter. 2 Peter iii. 5, 6, 7. "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by," (or according to) "the word of God the heavens were of old, and the *earth* standing out of the water and in the water; by which the *world* that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the *heavens* and the *earth* which are now, by" (or according to) "the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." This paragraph has been applied by some *world-burners* to the time yet future, when the Lord shall come to reign on the throne of his father David; but it will be seen, before we close these articles, that it has no such application.

In the 2d chapter of this Epistle, 5th verse, allusion is also made to this subject: "And spared not the *old world*, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing the flood upon the world of the ungodly." Let us now turn to the account given of the flood by that divine historian Moses. "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth," and He said, "I will destroy man whom I have created, *from the face of the earth*, both man and beast, and the creeping animal, and the fowls of the air." Again, He says—"The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them: and behold, I will destroy them from the earth." Once more He says—"And behold, I, even I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, in which is the breath of life, from under heaven: and every thing that is on the earth shall die." These references may be found in the 6th chapter of Genesis.

In order to understand this subject fully, we must,

1st. Attend to the meaning of the terms *earth* and *world*, and learn their signification.

2. We must know the *purpose* of God in sending the flood.

Now the Greek word *ge, earth*, has the following meanings: the land, the earth, the world, the inhabitants of the earth, *a* land, region, tract, country, territory, Canaan or Palestine, a city, the inhabitants of any region or country: land which may be tilled, soil, field, the fruit or produce of the earth; the ground, i. e. to be inferior, imperfect, transient, perishable.

And just here, I will remark, that this word is, comparatively, but seldom applied to the whole globe in the scriptures. It is generally used in a limited sense, as the context in any given case will abundantly show. I hope to prove this in reference to the flood.

The word *Kosmos*, world, signifies order, regularity, regular disposition; ornament, decoration, embellishment; the world, universe, the earth, globe, a region, country, Palestine, the inhabitants of the earth, human race; the many, multitude, public; a multitude of things, vast collection or aggregate; from the Hebrew the present world, or age, or period of the world, as marked by imperfection, wickedness and vice. The men of this world, as imperfect, ignorant and vicious; the things of this age or world, as being frail, transient, &c.

I shall first attend to the term *earth*, as used by Moses and Peter.

Does the term *earth*, used by Moses, mean the globe, or *only* that extent of its surface which was then populated?

We have already given you the meanings of the original word, by which it is manifest that we are supported in the limited use of the word. And now the question arises, Was it necessary, in order to accomplish the purpose of God, to envelope the whole globe in water?

It is evident to my mind that the term earth, in reference to the flood, imports no more than the land, country, or territory then inhabited. This view is sustained by Peter when he speaks of God "*bringing in the flood* upon the world of the ungodly." If the question, then, be asked, upon what world did God bring the flood? the answer is, in the language of Peter, "*upon the world of the ungodly.*" This limits the flood to that portion of the "earth" which was then populated; which, perhaps, was not more than one fourth of the globe.

The purpose of God was to "destroy the world

of the ungodly;" and to say that He could not do this, without enveloping the whole globe with water, is to limit his power. A large portion of the globe is, at the present time, under a "flood," but the whole globe is not.

Peter, speaking of the "scoffers" of his day, says: "For this they *willingly* are ignorant of, that, according to the word of God, the heavens were of old, and the *earth* standing *out of* the water and *in* the water: by which (water) the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." The earth still stands '*out* of the water and *in* the water:' and it would be a comparatively easy matter to deluge any single country on the globe by upheaving the earth beneath the vast deep, and causing the waters to flow over the land. This could be done without producing a universal flood. It could be accomplished by convulsions of the earth—a principle by which numerous islands have been formed in the Pacific, and other Oceans. In many places on the globe these physical changes, on a small scale, are continually taking place. In some the ocean recedes from the shore, thus increasing the *quantum* of land or earth; in others it encroaches upon the land. In some cases the earth is elevated for miles in extent, in others depressed. These are practical examples, and display the philosophy of the subject.

In the first chapter of Genesis we have this account: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." In this place the earth is represented as being *covered* with water. At the 9th verse we read: "And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear." In the 2d chapter we read of a river which "went out of Eden to *water* the garden;" this was divided into four "heads." "The name of the first is Pison;" the second "Gihon;" the third "Hiddekel;" the fourth "Euphrates." Thus we find the earth, it is presumed, at the flood; for we have no indication of any physical changes in the earth before the flood. There is no proof that it rained before the deluge, the earth, at that time, being in this respect like the land of Egypt. Egypt is watered by the Nile; Eden was watered by a river divided into four streams; and, in addition to that, in as much as "the Lord had not caused it to rain upon the earth, there went up a mist" which settled in the form of dew upon the earth and the productions of the earth.

It is objected to my view of this matter, that the whole globe bears marks of having been once *covered* with water. This position is freely granted; but it does not in the least degree militate against the truth of my position. I have already shown, by reference to Genesis, that the earth originally was entirely enveloped with water; but it does not follow, therefore, that it was so at the flood. This is quite another question. There is a geological page in God's Book of Nature which teaches us that the fossil remains which are found on the earth's surface, as well as deeply imbedded in the bowels, are much older than the flood; yes, as old as the creation! Besides, water is not the agent by which bones, shells, wood, &c., &c., become *petrified*. Heat, caloric, electricity—this is the wonder working agent in these productions. There is no doubt but the centre of the earth is filled with liquid fire; and being thus pent up in the bowels of the earth, the volcanoes are only so many safety valves through which the super-abundant heat may escape.

As our object, in these articles, is more to call attention to the subject than to elaborate it, we will briefly state the reasons on which our view of this case is based:

1. The terms "earth" and "world" are more frequently than otherwise used in a limited sense. Examples of this may be found in the predictions concerning Babylon, Ninevah, Edom and Jerusalem, to which, however, we shall refer again.

2. The purpose of God did not require the complete deluge of the globe, it being merely to destroy "the world of the ungodly;" which "world" did not embrace the globe.

3. The ark, though large, could not have contained "sevens," or "pairs" of *all* the animals on the globe, and the fowls of heaven. It would have been a physical impossibility.

4. Mount Ararat is said to rise 12,000 feet above the level of the sea, and Moses states that the waters prevailed "fifteen cubits upwards." We suppose, then, that the waters covered Mount Ararat about 28 feet. This would not cover the highest mountains on the *globe*.

5. A distinguished philosopher has calculated that there is not water enough on the globe, including the vapor of the atmosphere, to cover the earth, with its present size, more than an inch in depth.

6. If a sufficient quantity of water could be collected on the earth's surface to envelope the globe, and cover the highest mountains, its increased *gravity* would be such as to disturb the harmony of the Solar System.

7. In this case, the motion of the earth on its axis, from west to east, would have produced such a current in the waters *westward*, that, instead of the ark resting on Mount Ararat, it would have been carried to the Western Continent. This current would absolutely have been irresistible! Like a mighty tornado it would have swept every thing before it.

8. As proof that the earth itself was not destroyed, as some suppose, the dove, sent forth by Noah, finally returned with an "olive leaf plucked off," thus showing that trees were yet standing. And modern travellers inform us that, there are trees in Mexico and France, the yearly growth of which is clearly indicated by their external appearance; and that these indications prove them to be much older than the flood.

Thus we have given the *heads* of the reasons on which we rely in this matter; and, if we have not proven our position, we have, at least, furnished a subject for examination and reflection.

In our next article we shall make a very important application of the view we have now presented; and we hope our readers will follow us in this investigation, and see whether we present the truth or not.

J. T. W.

☞ Vol. III.—We can supply any who may wish it the entire volume of the Examiner for 1848 bound or unbound as they like. They will be furnished at the subscription price, adding, when ordered bound, 25 cts. for each copy for binding. We find we *cannot* put four copies bound at $2, as we stated in a previous number. The cost of binding is more than we expected. We prefer to furnish them unbound, which is the only way they can be sent by mail.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

The Scripture Doctrine.

By H. H. Dobney.

Chapter I.—Second Part.

"Whoever is afraid of submitting any question, civil or religious, to the test of free discussion, seems to me to be more in love with his own opinion than with truth."—Bishop Watson.

It is with feelings of deep and even painful anxiety that I approach that part of our subject which is now before us. With the preceding chapters my brethren will for the most part agree, and may possibly accept them as some little service rendered to the common cause. Here, however the approval of many will terminate, and with not a few will be exchanged for something worse than the opposite. Still I must proceed, for Truth, as I believe, beckons me on. Let me reverently follow. Yet how can I be insensible to the fact that the direction in which my guide is leading me, is scarcely that in which many of my brethren affirm Truth to lead? Beyond a doubt the opinions of wise and good men are entitled to respectful attention, and it is a grave consideration that the majority of christian people have adopted views which I find myself bound to reject; how then shall I not be sensitively alive to the circumstances of my position? Have so many of the wisest and best of men been left in error, men too whom God has signally honored? Have they been for the most part mistaking the voice of the oracle, and misinterpreting the counsels of heaven on this solemn subject? Painfully and oppressively do I feel this *argumentum ad verecundiam*.

But, on the other hand, are not the best of men fallible? And have not many of the wisest given strange proof of their fallibility? Did not nearly all the wise and good once believe, with Pascal and Fenelon, in transubstantiation and all the other dogmas of the Romish church? Did even the mighty Luther, did the Reformers, achieve their perfect emancipation from all forms of error, and leave no work of reformation for their successors? What shall we say to the consubstantiation of the former, and to the dark doctrine of reprobation so tenaciously held in the stern and iron age that Geneva, Scotland, and even England knew? Why to this day it is Church of England orthodoxy to believe that no one can be saved who doubts the Athanasian creed;* and fifteen thousand clergymen now living have solemnly sworn their assent and consent to that perilous assertion. Is it true? Nor is it so long since it was held sound doctrine among many of the evangelical dissenters that God had provided no Saviour for mankind at large, but only for a little flock, a chosen few; and it was heresy to maintain that there were glad tidings for every creature. And still the innumerable controversies, which are maintained with a spirit which only too well justifies the current phrase, *odium theologicum*, shows how marvellously small is every man's belief in another's infallibility, and may keep the writer in countenance in replying to any who shall unreasonably press the opinions of individuals or communities, 'Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?'

Besides, is it not our protestant boast, too often indeed a mere empty boast, vox et preteræa nihil, that 'the bible, and the bible alone &c.,' and have we not for this aphorism, admirable if only it were true, complacently decreed the apotheosis of the author of so gratifying a period? Let it not then be deemed *quite* an unpardonable sin if we venture to construe the assertion literally, and so, pushing our way through all that look infallibility, exercise our right of sitting at the feet of the great teacher, whose words—Call no man your father on earth, no man your master, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren,—were spoken not to be eulogised on holiday occasions, or when they may serve a turn, but to be recognised as a daily rule of life; "He is our master in abstract speculation—our master in religious belief—our master in morals, and in the ordering of every day's affairs."

Again, is not theology a science? Is not the word of God better understood now than in any age since the apostolic? And if no one competently informed will dispute this, let us ask ourselves whether we have reached the *Ultima Thule* of religious truth, so that in the ages to come, those glorious ages! there will be no discoveries to reward the diligent, and all the people of God will have nothing to do but re-publish and stereotype for all time the theological works of the present day! Believe it who can. Rather is the book of revelation perfect. In those unutterably more glorious eras that are in reserve for the church, there will be no other bible than our own to exercise the loftier powers of our happier successors to the end of the world. Nor needs it. Even in the latest age of all, the wise householder shall bring out thereof 'things both new and old;' and that prayer of the psalmist shall never be in vain, Open thou my eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law. And just as we have been compelled somewhat to modify the theology of a former day, deeming ourselves more favored than our honored forefathers, so will the holy men of a coming age take leave to consider some of the things most surely believed amongst us, not proven, while they will also bring into luminous prominence some mighty truths which the popular theology of the nineteenth century dooms to unwise neglect.

There is still another consolation. Truth can stand any test. The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, and purified seven times. No weapon formed there-against shall prosper. This is my comfort. And if the popular doctrine of the real eternity (not of punishment but) of torment be of God, it cannot be overthrown. It will be the more plainly demonstrated the more it is examined, and will stand out in the bolder relief from the feebleness of the opposing arguments. The orthodox have nothing to fear. Let them put their confidence in truth, and in the God of truth. They have beside almost all christendom, ostensibly, at all events, on their part. They can well afford therefore to be calm and fair and temperate and just; they might well afford even more than this.

On the other hand, if the prevailing notion be of man;—if it be some not much examined doctrine that has come down to us from the darker ages, some unpurged-away result of the former univer-

*Most readers will remember that the Athanasian creed professes to set forth the "Catholick faith," but in reality is chiefly occupied with a sort of philosophy, falsely so called, of the divine essence, unintelligible and contradictory, of which it daringly affirms, "Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly!"

sality of a system to which the largest inventable amount of terror was indispensable;—if, from various circumstances, the religious world have adopted it with far less of rigid investigation than they have been compelled to give to other doctrines;—if it cannot be maintained by the fair application of those sound hermeneutical principles which are the support of the rest of the evangelical system;—and if the same sort of reasoning by which this notion is elicited from a few texts would, to a great extent, subvert the very system of which it is made a part; if all, or only some of this be so, then, whatever of obloquy may be heaped upon me, or however forgetful some of my brethren may be of the law of kindness and the higher law of truth, it will ultimately be seen that no disservice, but the contrary, has been done to the great cause of evangelical religion, which I would a thousand times rather die than injure.

But not to prolong these introductory observations, let us pass on to a necessary but brief remark concerning

The Burden of Proof.

"It is a point of great importance to decide in each case, at the outset, in your own mind, and clearly to point out to the hearer, as occasion may serve, on which side the presumption lies, and to which belongs the [onus probandi] *Burden of Proof*. For though it may often be expedient to bring forward more proofs than can fairly be demanded of you, it is always desirable when this is the case that it should be *known*, and that the strength of the cause should be estimated accordingly."*

The eminent writer from whom this just remark is quoted, and to whom the present age owe so large a debt of obligation, has however laid down a principle from which, though with great diffidence, I must profess my entire dissent; namely, that the *onus* lies with him who calls in question any received doctrine. Surely he who affirms a thing is bound to make good his assertion. Till proved, it is nothing but his mere *ipsi dixit*; and I am not to be called on to believe it, or else be held bound to disprove it. I await the proof; when furnished, if sufficient, I believe; but not till then. Instead, however, of my attempting here what is already done to hand for us, and by a writer of no ordinary acuteness, the reader will pardon my referring him to a work in which this point is already argued, and to my mind decided.†

The burden of proof then lies with those who assert that never-ending torment is in reserve for multitudes of God's intelligent, but alas! rebellious creatures. If they affirm this appalling idea, they are bound to make it good. They must bring forth their strong reasons. If it be the doctrine of revelation the proof lies at hand, and can be easily produced. Till this is done, not merely is no man bound to believe it; he ought not to believe; he must wait for the evidence. Let us therefore recognise

The Kind of Evidence demanded.

As a burden of proof as a whole lies with the asserters of the popular doctrine; so does it at every stage of the argument. They must make good their footing step by step from the beginning to the end. With mathematical precision must they advance, till in the face of all men they are entitled to crown their work with the letters it has often been so delightful to pronounce—Q. E. D. I have never seen this done yet. To my mind there has been a serious flaw in all evidence hitherto presented; and I am sometimes lost in astonishment that in so solemn an argument, one so overwhelmingly awful, evidence should be admitted as satisfactory, of a kind which would never be employed on behalf of the grand truths of the gospel; and for this reason, that the great evangelical verities are so abundantly proved, that the believer feels that he can afford to cast away everything that is even but slightly doubtful. For the divinity of Christ, for example, we would not sigh if enlightened criticism deprived us of fifty texts which it may have been the custom to quote in its defence. We would exult rather to be disencumbered of all that could be fairly questioned, though ever so slightly. We deem the great mystery of godliness to be like the name wrought in the shield of Phidias; and we can be calm and just and kind to an opponent. But how is it with the doctrine in question? Where is that generosity towards an ingenuous enquirer, who is in doubt, which confidence in the abundance, the variety, the force of evidence so notoriously inspires.

Assuredly, if it be the doctrine of scripture, it is plainly taught in our sacred records, and in various ways. We shall not be shut up to an equivocal word or two in a comparatively few texts; but it will somehow or other be involved in different lines of argument, the logical force of which will necessitate our understanding it just so.* But what is the fact of the present case? Take away the proof sought to be derived from the phrase 'everlasting punishment' (which we shall not find on a candid examination to necessitate belief) and a few similar expressions, which may be opposed by expressions of an opposite character, and what is left? Where are the lines of argument, the trains of reasoning adopted in the scriptures, which only give out a fair meaning when this doctrine is deduced? like an elaborate lock which will open only by the application of the proper key, so that the key is thereby authenticated as genuine. I submit therefore—

1. That it is not enough for any party to bring forward passages of scripture, and cast them before us in their baldness, as foreclosing all discussion. For there are other classes of texts which would not be allowed to prove anything if produced in the same bald manner. If the universalist, for example, should adduce, as proving his theory, such texts as these—'the restitution of all things;' 'I if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me;' 'God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth;' 'He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighted in mercy;'—then the orthodox would promptly and properly demand that all such passages should be examined in their connection, that the precise value of each

*Dr. Whately's Rhetoric, part I. chap. iii. § 2.

†Baptism, in its Mode and Subjects, by Alexander Carson, L. L. D. Chapter I.

*In argument with 'the common people' how do we substantiate the views we present on the great leading truths? Assuredly not by philological niceties, nor by laying the stress on mere words that look to teach a certain doctrine, but by masses of arguments from scripture that demonstrate the indispensableness of just such or such a view.

should be separately ascertained, that they should be compared with and, if necessary, modified by other statements. But the principle which is sound to-day against one view, is sound to-morrow even if it make against another view, and sound every day. So that,—

2. Prior to any investigation of the proper force of terms employed by the inspired writers, the mere assertion of 'everlasting punishment,' and the like, on the one hand, is sufficiently met, on the other, by the assertion that the wicked 'shall be punished with everlasting destruction,' that they shall 'utterly perish,' and similar declarations. If the phrase *everlasting destruction* is not allowed to settle the entire question at once, so neither can the phrase *everlasting punishment*. If one party hold up the one text as decisive, another party may as fairly hold up the other as decisive. But certainly prior to investigating the proper force of terms, there would, to say the least, be an equilibrium established; or rather, since destruction would be punishment, and everlasting destruction would be therefore everlasting punishment, the balance (more especially considering that both texts are thus interpreted by one and the same principle) would incline against the notion of an eternity of misery.

3. In order, then, satisfactorily to place with the truths which have a right to be most surely believed among us, the doctrine of a real eternity of conscious torment, the preachers thereof must show from scripture,—

That when Christ stands forth, not merely as the deliverer from woe and blank despair and second death, but also as the giver of eternal life to his followers, this magnificent promise cannot possibly be understood literally, but must of necessity be interpreted metaphorically. To the honor which he seems so frequently to assume, as the dispenser of immortality, it must be shown that he has no title: so that those who have bent the knee to him for this unutterable grand endowment, which more than any other makes us partakers of the divine nature, must recall that portion of the homage which we have rendered to him as emphatically, 'Christ our Life;' for that while we derive our happiness from him, we wear our crown of immortality quite independently of him, and thus the Prince of Life, who has 'upon his head many crowns,' has in reality one less than his words had led us to believe And then they must show,—

That when the God of truth threatens the sinner with *destruction*, in many mutually consistent passages, the terms employed cannot be understood literally, but must be understood metaphorically. Which must be either because man is necessarily indestructible; or, because the Judge will not exert the power he possesses to destroy; or, will exert his power to prevent the sinner naturally dying out of existence, and so will by an act of omnipotence keep him alive for ever and ever in order to torment him! And in reference to this last idea the remark may be suffered, That the sinner is either necessarily immortal, (which will scarcely be affirmed) or else he is immortal only by the will and conservation of God. So that the above awful inference is just (and truth can rejoice in undisguised phraseology) that God will, of his own free act, uphold in life for ever and ever the unhappy sinner, for no other purpose than to punish him.

Verily the evidence for this had need be strong. It is not metaphysical subtleties, nor even philological niceties (invaluable in their place) that must build the height of this great argument; but mighty masses of obvious truth must be piled upon a mountain base, to raise this everlasting pyramid of infinitely more than sepulchral gloom, which is for ever and for evermore to throw its dark and appalling shadow across the universe of God.

We know indeed from the oracles of truth 'that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' And knowing 'the terrors of the Lord' we daily beseech our fellows to flee from the wrath to come. But while we scruple never to use any language which the Most High has employed in his revelation of mercy, and ascribe to him all the titles that he claims—Father—Lawgiver—Judge,—we nowhere find him set forth as purposely prolonging the existence of his wretched victims—drawing it out, of his own free will, a geafter age, to all eternity, in order that he may fill and saturate it with most exquisite and unutterable and unceasing misery.

We say that a theory like this, which presents the righteous God under such a terrific aspect—which secures the never-ending existence of sin and suffering in a universe presided over by wisdom and justice and love and mercy,—which if really credited by any of us (in the present state at all events) might well make reason more than totter on her throne, and convert all christendom into one mighty maniac cell, where, in the grasp of the demon of terror, the most benevolent would be the most hopelessly affrighted,—we say that such an appalling theory, pregnant with horrors which no created being can by any means represent to his mind (far the vastest conceptions which the mightiest intelligences form of eternity is of necessity short of the true idea by a whole infinity) had need be sustained by evidence proportionately strong.

Assuredly if it be a truth it is second to none on the page of revelation; eclipsed by none more momentous; but rather does itself overtop and overshadow almost every other. Surely the disciple of Christ who is ardently solicitous to see the universal spread of vital christianity, will in an answerable degree be concerned, as, on the one hand, not to diminish aught from that salutary amount of terror which the infinite wisdom has exhibited, so, on the other, not to overlay and burden the gospel revelation with more of the terrific than its blessed author—the only wise God—has seen fit to embody therein.

And as every word that God has uttered must be true, and every decision of his will the dictate of the profoundest wisdom, the exact truth that lies in the volume of revelation, whatever that may be, must be precisely that which above all human computation is the most admirably adapted to produce the largest amount of varied good, if only it can be discovered and brought to bear on the consciences and judgments and affections of men. The purer the truth we exhibit, the mightier and more extensive its blessed results. And in proportion to the magnitude of any truth, and its bearing on the character of God, on the honor of his government and the welfare of man, will generally be its evidence; the more important, the more clearly will it stand revealed. What christian wishes to blink the question of the genuineness and authenticity of the scriptures? Who turns pale with

fear, and entreats men to hush and drop the subject, when the Creatorship of the Son of God, or the fact of an atonement for sin, or of justification by faith, or of a benign and heavenly influence exerted on the minds and hearts of men, is spoken of? Or which of the subjects, that we are intelligently confident are taught in scripture, do we pray and plot to have tabooed? Or what man living deprecates the most searching investigation into anything he thoroughly believes? And the more important it is, and the more abundant and clear its evidences, the more calmly and rejoicingly do we court inquiry. We christians care, or at least profess to care, for nothing but truth. Let us have it at whatever cost, and as pure as may be, fresh welling up from the sacred fount.

Yes, if the doctrine of never-ending torment for innumerable myriads of God's creatures be indeed contained in scripture, beyond a doubt it will be found repeated over and over again, with every variety of phrase and of diligently sought illustration. It will be indissolubly entwined in numerous arguments; will be the only fair result to which various lines of apostolic reasoning conduct. Concede text after text, it will still remain. Such a portentous truth cannot be dimly set forth. We ask then for the massive arguments to be produced; and we almost venture to ask for that manly and christian bearing in the discussion which the holders of divine truth so naturally exhibit.

And let it be pardoned the writer if he add, that it is not the misrepresentation of our views and arguments--not angry protestations against universalism—nor insinuations against our orthodoxy—nor unworthy assertions that our doctrine is all delectable to the sinner—nor presumptuous declamation that, if we be correct, then "the death of Christ was too costly an atonement," and that "another Saviour is provided for the sinner," and that "God was cruel to his Son,"—it is not exactly this kind of thing (of which there has been no lack) that so grave an argument demands, or by which the sacred cause of truth can be advanced. Let not the weapons of our warfare be thus carnal, lest the Master reproves us saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

REASON AND ITS USE.

"*Come now let us* REASON *together saith the Lord:*" Isa. 1, 18. Our reasoning faculties are those mental powers by which we are enabled to *judge—weigh—compare*, and determine in regard to those *objects* or *principles* that are presented to our minds. This power is given us to *distinguish* truth from falsehood; and good from evil. To be destitute of reason is to be an idiot or insane. To possess it and not exercise it is fanaticism. Such persons are governed by *feelings*, and are the sport of any deception that may arouse their feelings, or excite them.

Many religionists scout reason; but it always happens to be when reason is *against* them; for, they will reason as hard as any one while there is any reason for their opinions or practices; when reason fails them they turn from it in anger, and settle down under their feelings, superstition, or bigotry, which they mis-call faith. Such persons often strive to hide the absurdity of their theories by pleading their *experience* [*i. e. feelings*] or the parrot cry of "*mystery.*" That there is both experience and mystery we do not doubt; but, both must be brought to the test of reason; if they give the lie to that, they are *themselves liars.* If God is himself the author of our reasoning powers there can be nothing true that plainly contradicts reason. Jehovah has placed his sanction on the exercise of this power in the text at the head of this article. Only bigots or fanatics wish to reverse God's decision on that point. It is to justify their present absurd principles or practices that makes men attempt to cry down reason; such persons are always to be suspected; there is no trusting them. Some eminent men have done justice in their acknowledgments on this subject, whatever their own practice may have been.

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON says—"When we say God hath revealed anything, we must be ready to prove it, or else we say nothing. If we turn off *reason* here, we level the best religion in the world with the wildest and most absurd enthusiasms. And it does not alter the case much to give reason ill names, to call it *blind* and *carnal reason.*—For our parts we apprehend no manner of inconvenience in having reason on our side; nor need we desire a better evidence, that any man is in the wrong, than to hear him declare against reason, and thereby to acknowledge that reason is against him. Some men seem to think, that they oblige God mightily by believing plain contradictions; but the matter is quite otherwise. God never offers anything to any man's belief, that plainly contradicts the natural and essential notions of his mind; because this would be for God to destroy his own workmanship, and to impose that upon the understanding of man, which, whilst it remains what it is, it cannot possibly admit."

BISHOP WATSON said—"It will not be easy for missionaries of any nation to make much impression on the pagans of any country; because missionaries in general, instead of teaching a simple system of Christianity, have perplexed their hearers with unintelligible doctrines not expressly delivered in scripture, but fabricated from the conceits, passions, and prejudices of men. Christianity is a *rational* religion."

ROBERT HALL says—"The light of revelation, it should be remembered, is not opposite to the *light of reason;* the former presupposes the latter; they are both emanations from the same source; and the discoveries of the Bible, however supernatural, are addressed to the *understanding*, [*reason,*] the only medium of information whether human or divine. Revealed religion is not a cloud that overshadows *reason:* it is a superior illumination, designed to perfect its exercise, and supply its deficiencies." That is—It brings to view things which reason *unaided* could never find out; yet, they do not contradict reason, but have a beautiful agreement with it.

DR. ADAM CLARKE says—"The doctrine which cannot stand the test of rational investigation cannot be true. We have gone too far when we have said, such and such doctrines should not be sub-

jected to rational investigation, being doctrines of pure revelation. I know of no such doctrine in the Bible. The doctrines of this book are doctrines of *eternal reason*, and they are revealed because they are such."

JOHN WESLEY said—"In the earliest times there were not wanting well-meaning men, who, not having much reason themselves, imagined that reason was of no use in religion: yea, rather that it was a hindrance to it. And there has not been wanting a succession of men, who have believed and asserted the same thing. But never was there a greater number of these in the Christian church, at least in Britain, than at this day."

We might multiply testimony from worthy and eminent men to the use and importance of reason, but the foregoing must suffice for the present. We have endeavored to use the reason our Creator has given us without suffering it to be trammeled by sects—parties—or previous prejudices, in searching after truth in the Bible and in the works of God. *Our reason* has pronounced the doctrine of an immortal soul in man a fable, unsupported by revelation; and the doctrine of an immortal soul in endless torments an *unmixed lie.*

The Bible doctrine in regard to man's destiny is *Life* or *Death:* this is the contrast everywhere presented. Here reason and revelation are in harmony. Men are taught that they are dying. Not only reason and revelation unite in this truth, but experience comes in to confirm it. Man being found in this situation, *Revelation* comes to his aid and comfort with the *Proclamation*, or *Good News* of LIFE—ETERNAL LIFE. Men may refuse this gospel offer, because they are free agents, or moral beings; but they need not—they may live. Here then we take our stand, that—*The Gospel* PROCLAMATION *and the Gospel* PROMISE *is, pre-eminently,* LIFE. This proposition we shall hereafter enlarge upon; and we trust to make the beauty and glory of the gospel of the favor of God stand out in its true glory, stript of "the abomination of desolation"—endless torments for immortal souls—which has so long disgraced Christianity, and driven men into universalism and infidelity. We conclude these remarks in the language of God by the prophet: "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the *death* of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for *why* will you die"? what *reason* can you give why you will die?

"LIFE IN CHRIST."—Edward White, Congregational minister, Hereford, England, at the close of his discourses, in which he has shown most triumphantly that the wicked are to be destroyed, and have no immortality, because "Immortality is the Peculiar Privilege of the Regenerate," adds the following note:

"The English reader who may desire to enter upon a further investigation of the general subject of these discourses will consult with advantage, I. On the question of the IMMORTALITY of the soul, Enfield's compendium of Brucker's History of Philosophy, in which he will discover how very far the ancient heathen were from a general adoption of that tenet as a dictate of common sense; and Dodwell's controversy with Clark and Chishull, with the continuation ascribed to Earberry, in which he will also discover the unanimity of the primitive Christians in rejecting the doctrine of man's natural eternity. The translation of Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho, published by Mr. Bickersteth in his volume of the "Christian Fathers," will likewise afford matter for much interesting reflection for those who may desire to know *when* the common opinion first took root in the Church. The Church was surrounded on all hands by believers in the pre-existence and natural immortality of souls, Platonists and Pharisees. In the early part of his Christian life, Justin, a Platonist, taught the common view in his "Apologies;" afterwards, he adopted the *Christian doctrine, and published it in his "Dialogue."* The Platonic notion, however, steadily gained ground in the Church, favouring, as it did, both human vanity, and the terrific sway of spiritual despotism; until, at length, the last clear vestiges of the truth are found in the pages of Arnobius, A. D. 290, who argues, at great length, on the principles of the present Discourses. It is remarkable that from that time the doctrine of *Purgatory* waxed stronger and stronger, perhaps as the natural alleviation invented by afflicted humanity groaning under the burden of the prevalent tremendous belief. II. On the subject of FUTURE PUNISHMENT the following works may be recommended to the reader in support of the preceding arguments:—Laws Theory of Religion; Whately's Lectures on Future Life; Fortaine on the Immortality of the Wicked; Storrs' Sermons on Eternal Punishment, a cheap and useful publication; an anonymous pamphlet on "Eternal Torments," published at Bristol in 1845: and lastly, the recent NOTES *on Future Punishment,* (now in the second edition, Ward, 1846.) of Mr. DOBNEY, to whom belongs the credit of having opened for the last time, with equal courage, intelligence and pious feeling a controversy which it is to be hoped will not again be contemptuously dismissed from before the public eye, until the energies of a numerous band of fellow-labourers have at least urged it upon the attention of all the Churches of the country."

FUTURE PUNISHMENT, BY H. H. DOBNEY, [a Baptist minister of England.] This work, noticed in our last, and one chapter from which is found in the present number of the Examiner, is to be immediately *republished.* It will be published just as received from England, 278 pages 12 mo. The price will be 50 cents in paper covers, or 75 cents bound. One third discount to wholesale purchasers. Send us your orders immediately.

NOTICES.—Adam Dixon. Bundle sent by Express.

E. T. Bussell. Money received, and 7 copies of Vol. 3 sent as directed, and six new subscribers for Vol. 4 entered on our books. *Thank you.*

N. M. Catlin. All right.

To all our Correspondents we say—if you receive from us what you send for, that is evidence that your letters are received.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1849. No. 2.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

"Does the soul or mind exist in a conscious state, after death, till the resurrection?"

MR. WALSH: I have read with care your last. Both you and your readers have a right to demand from me a candid reply, or a frank confession of inability.

I shall write with as much conciseness as possible, seeking to make plain my meaning, and clear my argument; attempting none of the decorations of rhetoric; no appeal to passion. I seek not to conceal, but to render clear and plain. I wish to fix the attention of our readers upon several, to me, unaccountable and inexplainable statements and facts, if your view be the true one. On that supposition, there are none of the human family *now* in heaven, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah, and a few others who have been raised from the dead. Eph. 3: 14, Paul speaks of "the whole family in *heaven* and earth," and in Heb. 12: 23, of "the general assembly and church of the first born, written in heaven, and the *spirits* of *just* men made *perfect*."

Heb. 6: 12, he exhorts the Hebrew christians to be "followers of those who through faith and patience *inherit* the *promises*."

2. You maintain that the soul is not an entity, but a quality; that it has none, and can have no conscious existence separate from the body. Let the reader keep his eyes upon this sentiment, and read the following. Rev. 6: 9, "I saw under the altar, the *souls* of them that were slain for the word of God," and these souls cry "holy," and give honour to God. Acts 7: 59, Stephen "full of the Holy Ghost, and looking stedfastly into heaven," cried "Lord Jesus receive my *spirit*." I see no sense in this prayer, unless Stephen believed with martyrs in subsequent ages, that the soul went directly to heaven; and certainly none, if man possesses no spirit or soul which can exist separate from the body. These are mere statements, and they go to show that the bible is admirably well calculated to perpetuate the error, if it be one, held by most christians since the days of Christ, *that the soul outlives the body.*

THE DYING THIEF.

Luke 23: 43, Christ assures a dying, penitent human being, who addressed a prayer to him, "today shalt thou be with me in paradise." "Paradise," meaning primarily pleasure gardens, or fields, has been applied to Eden, which means pleasure or delight, and to any place of felicity, and hence to heaven. See 2 Cor. 12: 4, Rev. 2: 7.

Though we might wander into an interminable war of words, in reference to the ascension of Christ, still that would be evasion.

I make one point, and beg attention to that point definitely.

Christ did distinctly, to a dying penitent, promise that he should "*that day*" be in bliss and happiness with him.

Before death he was not in paradise, and according to your view is not now, but is as devoid of bliss as the clods that cover his body.

I wish now to notice several positions in your last. 1. I *proved*, by positive declarations of the bible, that man was the *image* or *likeness* of God." You deny it, without a shadow of counter proof (excuse this sentence) to show it an absurdity. But if it be an absurdity, then are the declarations of the bible an absurdity, for over and over again is it declared, so that there is as much reason to xuestion whether God made man, as that he made him in his image.

2. You admit my whole conclusion. You reason thus. Man's nature is organised, is compound, according to your (my) theory, mortal and immortal. Ergo, God is all these, on the ground that man's *nature* is God's *image:* and thus you reduce it to an absurdity. Now my whole argument was just this: If man is wholly material, if he does not possess a purely *spiritual* soul or mind, he cannot be the image of God; but he is the image of God, and therefore does possess a spiritual essence, soul or mind.

Now such is the exaltation of his nature, is the image of God.

This the bible affirms. Please disprove it.

A mere physical being cannot be in the image of God; nothing short of a purely spiritual nature can resemble God.

This you admit; therefore, man does possess, besides a physical body, a purely spiritual soul or mind. I shall wait to see how you will dispose of this argument.

Matthew 10: 28, I am perfectly willing to leave, with our mutual comments upon it, to the good sense of our readers.

2 Cor. 12: 2, 3. My argument here is overlooked. I quoted to prove two things. 1. Man's true identity is the mind. Paul was *certain* that the *man* was caught up to heaven, but in doubt whether his body was. 2. To show that the soul could be conscious and have revelations, separate from the body.

3. Though *you* think he had a mere representation, or view of heaven, it is evident Paul thought himself carried there. John speaks of seeing the heavens opened, but not of being caught up, or going to heaven.

4. Whatever may be the facts, the language could never have been used by one who believed existence possible only in connection with the body.

But I hasten to the most important passages, Phil. 1: 21 to 25. Let the reader turn to them. And now, dear sir, can there be any other meaning than this.

1. Paul declares for him "to live," was to honor and enjoy Christ, [verse 22] "this" (the honor and enjoyment of Christ,) "is the fruit of my labour." These are the results of living.

2. "But to die is gain"—to my personal advantage and profit, and hence I have a desire to die—"to depart," "*to return to port*" as MacKnight renders the place, [the same phrase is used in 2d Tim. 4: 5. "The time of my departure," &c.] "to be with Christ which is far better." One thought runs through the whole of this. It is gain to die, and hence he desires it, as it is far better for him personally to be with Christ, which would be his privilege immediately at death.

3. But "I am in a straight betwixt two" desires, viz: to be with Christ, to die, that I may be with him, and to remain to serve the church. "Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh, [to live] is more needful for you." It is personally to my advantage to die, but for your advantage that I live a little longer. That on your theory it was not gain to Paul to die, unless an unconscious state is better than to live in the enjoyment of the love of Christ, and the service of his church, I think you see, and and hence your effort to take from me this stronghold.

Let me transcribe MacKnight's translation and paraphrase.

Translation.

21. For to me to live is Christ, *but* to die is gain.

22. *Now* if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my *work*, yet what I *should* choose *I do not know*.

23. For I am *straightened of the two*, having a *strong desire* to depart* and be with Christ, *because that is by* much for better.

24. Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.

Paraphrase.

21. *For to me to live is* for the honour of Christ, for the advancement of his cause, but to die is gain to myself.

22. *Now if I live in the flesh, this* which I have mentioned concerning the honour of Christ, *is the fruit of my work, yet what I should choose*, whether life or death, *I do not know*.

23. *For I am straightened, &c., having a strong desire to depart and be with Christ which is far better*, for me than to continue in life, bearing the toils and evils, &c. to which I am exposed.

24. *Nevertheless, &c. is more needful for you* and the rest who have embraced the gospel, on which account I am willing to forego my own interest.

Excuse the length of this, and believe me, dear sir, your friend and well wisher, "henceforth expecting" till I "shall know as I am known."

WM. H. BREWSTER.

* In his note he remarks—the simple word signifies *to loose from a port*, and the compound word—*to return, to port*. It may be translated *to return*, namely to God. MacK. *in loc.*

RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.

MR. BREWSTER:—1st. You observe upon the supposition that my view is the true one, that "there are none of the human family *now* in heaven, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah, and a few others who have been raised from the dead." Suppose this to be true, what of it? "Dust thou art, and into dust shalt thou return," is as true of Adam's race as it was of Adam himself. There is nothing like going to heaven in that sentence! "David has not ascended to heaven;" and for the reason he has not, no other man has, except Enoch and Elijah.

2d. As to your allusion to "the whole family in *heaven* and earth," I will remark, that Paul certainly did not mean to teach that "disembodied spirits" and men in the flesh constituted one family. You make an allusion to a passage, and then, without stopping to explain it, you rush to the conclusion that it sustains your favorite theory! This is a strange way of conducting a controversy!

3d. Your reference to "the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven," has no more to do with our subject than it has with Jewish ablutions. And as to the argument, based on the expression—"the spirits of just men made perfect," if you insist upon it, I will prove that Christians, raised from the dead, and made immortal, are the "spirits of just men made perfect" by a resurrection from the dead.

4th. If you will read the 11th chapter of Hebrews you will find that all those worthies "died in faith, *not having received the promises*." It is strange you should so misapply the words of Paul. Men do not inherit "promises" when they die, unless it be the promise of "dust thou art and into dust shalt thou return."

5th. Your reference to Rev. vi. 6, xx. 4, does not help your cause. John saw these souls as he saw "the hundred and forty and four thousand, having their Father's name written on their foreheads." And as he saw the sea of glass, and those who had gotten the victory over the, &c., standing on it praising God. The fifth seal has reference to the bloody persecution of the Papacy. When the fifth seal, which has reference to that period in history, was opened, John saw under the altar (the very place where he ought to have seen them) "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God." The term soul, or souls, is here used as a figure of personification; and is designed to represent those who were put to death for the sake of the truth which they professed. They are represented as being under the altar, upon which, no doubt, they had been sacrificed, or "offered up," as Paul expresses it. They are spoken of as "crying with a loud voice." The blood of Abel is spoken of as crying also. "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the ground," said God to Cain. Those saints whom John saw had suffered martyrdom, and their blood, like water, had run down under the altar; and from thence their souls or blood is represented as crying. In the 20th chapter these souls or persons are spoken of as having a part in the first resurrection. They are, therefore, to be raised, and not to come down from heaven.

6th. Your reference to the case of Stephen will not help you. Peter tells his brethren—"where-

fore, let them that suffer (affliction or death) *according to the will of God*, COMMIT THE KEEPING OF THEIR SOULS (lives or spirits) to him in well doing, as to a faithful Creator." Christ and Stephen both "suffered according to the will of God," and both "committed the keeping of their souls," or lives, "to him, as to a faithful Creator," in hope of a resurrection to eternal life. Job (xxxii. 8) says, "Into thy hands I commit my spirit, (life;) *thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of Truth.*" Here the reason is given for committing his spirit into the hands of his Maker—for "thou hast *redeemed* me." "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God; when Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory," says Paul. What is more reasonable than for a dying man to commit his life to his Creator?

7th. You next refer to the case of the thief. Let us examine it. What did the thief desire? He prayed to Christ to be remembered by him. At what time or period? When thou *comest into thy kingdom*. Not when you die or are dead! Not when you ascend to the right hand of God! But when you *come* into *your* KINGDOM. The thief's request had reference to a time, or period, which is specified. *And the Lord's answer must be supposed to have reference to the same time or period, or else the thief could not have understood him.* The Lord's answer is equivalent to his having said: "I will remember you when, or at the time or period, of which you speak." The Lord said: "To-day," or this day, (period or time of which you speak,) "thou shalt be with me in Paradise." The term "day" frequently refers to a time, or period, and not to a literal day. And I will remark, that the thief's request demands such a construction of the phrase "to-day" in the passage before us. "Thou art to pass over Jordan this day." Deut. xi. 1. And yet they did not pass *that day*. The meaning is, you are to pass in a short time, or period. Again, in Gen. ii. 4, 17, "In the *day* (time or period) when God made the heavens and the earth." The Lord made heaven and earth in "six days," and yet it is spoken of as a "*day*." "To-day, if you will hear his voice," &c. "Now is the accepted time; now is the *day* of salvation;" Heb. iii. 16. This "*day*" of salvation has lasted 1800 years! Again, Paradise and the kingdom of God are one and the same thing. Christ's kingdom is not yet set up; when it is, Paradise will be restored, and the thief will be there. This, in my estimation, is the meaning of the passage: "Lord remember me when, or at the time, thou comest into thy kingdom. At that time, or "to-day," the day of my coming into my kingdom, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Jesus did not go to Paradise when he was crucified, but was taken down from the cross and laid in Joseph's sepulchre; and after his resurrection he said to Mary—"touch me not, for I have *not yet* ascended to my Father," &c. This kingdom is not yet established; before it is, he will come from heaven again. He has no throne except the throne of David, to which he is the only heir. When he reigns on that throne, on Mount Zion in Jerusalem, before his ancients gloriously, then the thief will be with him in Paradise.

8th. In relation to man's likeness and image, I submit the following criticism, from the learned DR. THOMAS, and adopt it as my own:

"This point is easily and quickly disposed of. By turning to Job xxxiii. 4, our friend will find it there written, "*The Spirit of God hath made me*, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me life." The Editors of the Common Version evidently regard this as a substantial citation of Gen. ii. 7, for they have affixed this text in the margin to the phrase "the Spirit of God." If then, we admit the appositeness of the marginal reference, it appears that Elihu understood, that "the Lord God, *Yehowah Elohim*, formed man" by the Ruach Elohim, or Spirit, by which Elohim fabricated all terrestrial things.

Again. Job saith, "*By his Spirit* he hath garnished the heavens"—xxvi. 13. Also David saith, "*By the Word* of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the Host of them *by the Breath* of his mouth—Ps. xxxiii. 6; and Paul saith "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed *by the Word of God*—Heb. xi. 3. All of which is averred in view of Gen. i. 31, where Moses saith, "And Elohim saw—*wyyar Elohim* ayth—all which was made, and behold it was very good." The harmony of these passages is, that the Elohim made, and framed, and furnished the heavens and all the hosts of them *by the Spirit*. Hence, in our first proposition, we affirm that the "Spirit of God formed man," to which, doubtless, our friend will now readily assent.

II. The elucidation of the second point involves a question of Hebrew Idiom. We shall therefore, remark upon this with all possible simplicity and brevity.

The principles of universal grammar require, in general, that *a verb agree with its nominative in number and person;* as, the Spirit moves; the waters roar. Here "the Spirit" is of the singular number and third person, and so is the verb "moves;" hence they agree in number and person: "the waters" is of the third person plural number, and so is the word "roar," hence they also agree. But in the first chapter of Genesis, this rule appears to be disregarded by the Spirit under whose dictation Moses wrote. In the first verse it reads, *Berayshith bara Elohim ayth*—In the beginning Elohim created. In this phrase, *bara* is the verb *in the third person singular*, and *Elohim* a noun in the *third person plural;* so that they do not agree according to the rule: for an agreement to ensue, either the noun should be *Eloh*, the third person singular, or it should remain as it is in the plural, and the verb should be changed to barau—*Elohim (they) created*. But it is not so; it reads literally, Elohim (he) created.

Speaking of *Elohim*, Dr. Wilson says, "That this noun, which is not unintentionally here joined with the singular verb *bara*, is nevertheless really plural, appears not merely from its termination *im*, but by its being frequently joined with adjectives, pronouns, and verbs in the plural—*Wyyomer Elohim nashah adam batzalmai-nu*, Elohim said, "Let *us* make man in *our* image," or form. Mr. Parkhurst in his lexicon under the word *alah*, cites many passages where Elohim is associated with other plurals. Upon close examination, there will be found no good ground to question the conclusion, that Elohim is a noun plural and signifies "*Gods*," and ought to be so rendered throughout this chapter.

But why the plural noun, Elohim, Gods, should have been associated with a singular verb in this chapter, Hebraists have been much perplexed to answer satisfactorily. Grammar failing, they have had recourse to doctrine to explain the enigma. Dr. Wilson truly remarks, that "*Elohim is not unintentionally here joined with the singular verb;*" though, in our opinion the Dr., as well as Mr. Parkhurst, have widely mistaken the intention. They think it was intended to reveal a Trinity of Persons in one God, or as some express it, "Society in God." Dr. Wilson remarks on the phrase "Let us make man," "it is an expression

of consultation, and marks a difference in man's creation from that of other creatures, in point of importance. "Let us make man," regards the animal nature; "In our Image," denotes his spiritual nature, which alone could resemble Deity.—"Let us make," etc., "in our image, after our likeness." Here is the plurality three times expressed, and that in the first person, a manifest agreement with, and proof of, the scriptural doctrine of a *plurality of the Deity*, to which, as God is one in essence, we give the name persons."

Elohim, "a name, says Parkhurst, usually given in the Hebrew Scriptures to the Ever-Blessed Trinity." He wrote a pamphlet against Dr. Priestly and Mr. Wakefield to prove a plurality of Elohim in Jehovah! In one thing we entirely agree with him, namely, that *a plurality of Agents is denoted in the Mosaic history of the terrestrial creation.* By faith we can understand, that the Spirit, or Word, operated in, by, and through them, in the formation of all things terrestrial; but, that all these Agents were in the Deity as parts of his essence constituting "Society in God," is too great a camel for our powers of deglutition.

A first principle with us in all reasonings upon this subject, is, that there is "one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." Another axiom is, that "he is the blessed and *only* Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; who *only* hath immortality, dwelling in the Light *which no man can approach unto:* WHOM NO MAN HATH SEEN, NOR CAN SEE"—1 Tim. vi. 15; i. 17: and again, "God is Spirit"—Jno. iv. 24; and he is "incorruptible"—*Rom.* i. 23;—the Incorruptible Spirit dwelling in Light is the scripture revelation of the self-existent Eternal, who is from everlasting to everlasting, God.

"No man," saith Jesus, "hath seen him at any time;" but Adam and Eve did see the Elohim; therefore, the Elohim and the Everlasting Father are not the same.

Elohim is a name bestowed on Angels and Orders of Men. In Psalm xcvii. 7, it is written "worship Him, all Elohim." Paul quotes this in Heb. i. 6, as a command of the Everlasting Father to the Angels, that they should worship Jesus as his Son when introduced into the world again, at the opening of the Future Age. Of the Son of Man it is said in Psalm viii. 5, "*Thou hast made him a little lower than the Elohim.*" Paul also applies this to Jesus, saying, "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than Angels." He continued inferior to them about 33 years and a half, from birth to resurrection; when he was exalted far above them in rank and dignity, even to the 'right hand of power,' which is enthroned in Light, where dwells the Majesty in the heavens.

Those to whom the Word of God came through Moses are styled Elohim; as it is written, in Psalm lxxxii. 6, "I have said, ye are Elohim; and all of you children of the Most High; but ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes;" see also *John* x. 34. "Thou shalt not revile the Elohim, nor curse the Ruler of thy people—Exod. xxiii. 28, that is, thou shalt not revile the Magistrates, nor curse the High Priest or King. See Acts xxii. 5.

Furthermore; it is a well-established principle of the scriptures of truth, that *what the Everlasting Father doth by his Agents, he is considered as doing by himself.* There is a maxim in law borrowed from this, which runs somehow thus, *quid facit per alios, facit per se*, what one doth by or through others, he does by himself. If this be borne in mind many seeming incongruities will be harmonized. Thus in Gen. xviii. 1, the Lord is said to have appeared to Abraham as he sat in his tent-door; but, when he first caught sight of the visitant, he did not see the Lord, but "three men," or Elohim, of whom one was the Chief. Read the whole chapter, and to verse 29 of the next, and it will be seen, that the Everlasting God talks and acts by or through those Elohim, but chiefly through one of them, styled "the Lord."

In Gen. xxxv. 9, God is said to appear to Jacob, and in verse 2, to say to him, "I am God Almighty, &c.;" and in verse 13, "God went up from him in the place where he talked with him." He was then at Bethel, where "the Elohim were" formerly "revealed unto him." On that occasion, he dreamed that he saw a ladder reaching from earth to heaven, "the Lord standing above it, and the Angels of God ascending and descending on it." These Angels were the Elohim, or "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation"—Heb. i. 14. They declared to Jacob once the promises made to his father and grand-father in the name of the "Invisible God;" he wrestled with God in wrestling with one of them, etc. Hence they speak in the first person as personators of the Invisible and Incorruptible Spirit, who is the real author of all they say and do.

Jacob's Ladder will furnish us with a hint or two in this place. It seems to represent *the interval of years, or totality of generations* which should elapse from the night of the vision until Jacob's Son and Lord should sit upon the throne of David, which the Everlasting Father shall give him. This long interval of years is the connecting ladder between Canaan *as it was in* Jacob's time, and Canaan *as it will be* when Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the Prophets, shall sit down with the Lord in his Kingdom. This ladder hath already spanned upwards of 3600 years; and during all that period "the Angels of God," or Elohim, "have been ascending and descending," though unseen by mankind at large. The years spanned by this ladder compose the duration of "the present evil world" as contrasted with "the world to come," or Future Age, of which Paul speaks in Heb. i. Of the Future Age he saith, "unto the Angels, or Elohim, hath God not put in subjection the World to Come whereof we speak"—*Chap.* ii. 5; from which we conclude, that he hath put in subjection the Present World, or Constitution of things, to the Elohim; but that "when he bringeth again the First Begotten into the world," the Elohim will be subordinated to him in the administration of human affairs. Jesus himself refers to this great event when he said to Nathanael, "Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the Angels of God—Elohim—ascending and descending upon the Son of Man"—*Jno.* i. 51. The change of relations is here obvious. In Jacob's Dream, the Lord was *above* the ladder and the Elohim were seen ascending and descending below the Lord and upon the Land; but at the time indicated by Jesus, the Elohim descend *upon* the Lord, who will then be in company with Jacob not far from Bethel in the same Land where the vision appeared to him. Thus, the Land and the Heavenly Attributes thereof will have then approximated, and the intermediate Ladder will have been removed. Jesus and the Saints, equal in physical constitution to the Elohim, and superior to them in the Kingdom of God, will judge, rule, or direct the movements of the Elohim in governing the nations committed to their charge. Hence, saith the Apostle, "Know you not that, we (the saints) shall judge Angels?—Cor. vi. 1. Yes; they will co-operate with the Saints as their subordinates having ceded to them their present direction of the affairs of nations.

Let us now hear the word of the Lord. The Invisible God spake to Job out of the whirlwind and said, 'where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, declare if thou knowest. Or, who hath stretched the line upon it? Or who laid the corner-stone thereof: when the Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy?—chap. xxxviii. 4–7. Job could not answer these questions. He knew, doubtless, what the Elohim had done; but, "touching the Almighty" by whose Spirit

they operated, "we cannot," saith Elihu, "find him out." The Elohim were these Morning Stars and Sons of God. Jesus is styled "the Bright and the Morning Star," "the Day Star," and the Son of God. To say, therefore, that the Elohim are Morning Stars and Sons of God is according to the analogy of scripture. When the Six Days Work was accomplished, a song of praise and shout of joy rent the Expanse; when they beheld the magnificent display of His Power who dwelleth in Light, and by whose spirit they had accomplished every thing.

The following illustration of the relation of the Elohim to the Everlasting Father and his power, suggests itself to us just now. Experimental philosophers can form water, air and earths; they can bring down lightning from the expanse; they can weigh, or rather calculate the weight of, the sun, moon and stars; they can speak by electricity, paint by sun-light, and outstrip the wind by fire. These are wonderful creations of their genius. But what have these they did not receive?—And from whom did they receive it? They subject certain substances to certain conditions. They do not originate a single principle. The elements, and the laws to which all simple and compound substances are subject, are independent of them. They may say, "Let water be formed," and by passing the electric spark through the gaseous mixture, water will be formed; but it is the power of God that does it, and not their's. The Elohim gave the word, they brought the latent elements of the world into play, they gave direction and application to power, and the Spirit of the Everlasting Father accomplished all they were employed to effect. The Everlasting Father by the Elohim created the heavens and the earth; *He* said, "Let there be light;" *He* saw that it was good; *He* made the Expanse; *He* called it Heaven; &c. He did it all through them; they executed what he empowered them to perform. This is the solution we offer of this grammatical enigma.

It is part of the "Strong Delusion," which has supplanted the Truth, to suppose, that the Everlasting Father left the throne of the Universe on a visit to this region of Immensity, where, like a mechanic building a house, he worked in creating the earth, and all things therein. After this fashion, he is supposed to have made man; and that, when he had finished his mechanism, he applied his mouth to his nostrils and "breathed into him a particle of his own divine essence, by which he became a living and immortal soul!" Such a precedure on the part of the "Only Potentate," whose abode is Light, and whose servants, the Elohim, are innumerable, would have been unfitting his dignity and underived exaltation. He has revealed himself to us as a Potentate, a King, a Lord, &c.; now they who fill these stations, commit to others the drudgery of executing their will and pleasure. And thus it is with the Invisible and Everlasting Potentate. His kingdom ruleth over all. His Angels, or Elohim, mighty in strength, do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his words. They are his hosts; his ministers, that do his pleasure.—*Psalm* ciii. 19—21.

In the light of this revelation, we understand the Mosaic record of the creation. It pleased the King Eternal, nearly 6000 years ago, to add a New Province to his Dominion; not by an original creation, but by the re-constitution of a globe already existing as one of the Solar Planets. He commanded his Angels to go and execute the work according to the order detailed by Moses. They hearkened unto the voice of his word; and in six days finished all they were commanded to do. But, without his power, they could have effected nothing; therefore, in the history, all things are referred to Him. He willed: they executed by his Spirit.

Now, on the Sixth Day, before Man was formed, the Elohim gave being to the lower animals. Among these was "the Serpent, more subtile than any beast of the field, which the Yehowah Elohim had made." It was a creature of observation, it noted the objects around it, and among these observed the "gods," to whom it told Eve she should be like it if she eat the fruit. In the Hebrew, the word rendered "gods," is Elohim, the same as occurs throughout the first chapter. From what other source but the sight of its eyes, unless by divine inspiration, could the Serpent have derived information about the "gods?" It spoke of what it had seen and heard. But the animals were still without a King; therefore, said one of the Elohim, "Let us make Man in *our* Image." There was none like them of all they had made; therefore, they determined to make an animal after their own *form*. They shaped him with head, limbs, and body like their own, so that he stood before them the earthly Image of the Heavenly Elohim. As much their image as Seth was the image of his Father Adam.—*Gen.* v. 3.

III. We do not say, that Man's *likeness* to the Elohim consisted in his being "very good;" but that the Spirit of God formed him "very good" in the same sense that it formed all other animals so. They were without character, so was he; his goodness was physical, not moral; that of the Elohim was both.

Yet, in a certain sense, Man was formed in the likeness of the Elohim. This likeness, we believe, consisted in the Man's *susceptibility of an exaltation to their nature and rank upon the same principles as they had attained thereto*. This capacity distinguished him from all the other animals they had formed. He was of *like capacity* to the Elohim. He could manifest intellect and disposition like to them, and he could know evil like them.

As Dr. Wilson remarks, "Let us make man," is an expression of consultation, and marks a difference in man's creation from that of other creatures, *in point of importance*." This is true, and we believe, that the "subtle serpent" overheard the consultation, and was therefore able to tell Eve, that there was a particular in which she should be *like* the Elohim—*Ka Elohim*—by eating the fruit, in which she could not resemble them unless she did eat, namely, in "knowing good *and* EVIL." In this point, man was unlike the Elohim when pronounced "very good." Nor was this part of the temptation a falsehood; for the Yehowah Elohim said to his compeers, "Behold the Man hath become AS *one of us*, to know good and evil"—ch. iii. 23. In this then, the Man became still more like the Elohim; and in this likeness he hath continued ever since. But thanks be to the Invisible Father, man is placed under a law of progression. His prototype has gone before. He was himself made "a little lower than the Elohim;" for he took not upon him *their nature*, but assumed that of the Seed of Abraham.—His nature is now like their's, being *spiritual*, that is, INCORRUPTIBLE AND IMMORTAL. "We shall be like him," says John; hence, also, "equal to the Angels," as he himself hath said. See Luke xx. 36.

"*Let us make man*, regards the animal nature," says Dr. Wilson; "*in our own image*," denotes the spiritual nature, which alone could resemble the Deity. If so, what can he imagine "*in our likeness*" means? The Doctor's Trinitarianism and Orientalism cramp his genius. "Man" is generic, and comprehends the "Image" and "Likeness." "Let us make man," that is, "Let us make an Image like ourselves in form and capacity;" they did not say "equal to," but resembling themselves. "The first Adam was of the earth, earthy;" his "spiritual nature," as divines term it, was common to him and his subject companions around him; they had bodies, souls, and spirits even as he, but not of the same *form and capacity* as the Elohim.

Lastly, the Arch-Elohim said, that the Man had become—*ka-chad*—LIKE *one* of themselves in the matter

of knowing good and evil. This also is an argument for his likeness to a plurality of persons; and it further shows, that the Elohim were once in a condition similar to man, after he had transgressed. The Yehowah Elohim himself declares, that they also had been *expeperimentally sensible of* evil, for this is the idea expressed by the Hebrew verb YADA *to know*, which the LXX translate by *eideo*. In short, we believe, that none of the Elohim of the Only Potentate's Dominion were created immortal; but earthly, or animal, like Adam. The Eternal Father is the only being who is originally immortal in any sense; hence it is said, that he "*only* hath immortality;" the immortality of all other intelligences is derived from Him as a reward for the obedience of faith. Just men at the resurrection of the First Fruits will be equal to the Elohim. Shall we say, that they did not attain to the same standard of equality by a similar progression, seeing that their superior, Jesus, "was made perfect through suffering?" We believe they were once animal men; that they had been "made subject to vanity, not willingly;" that while in the flesh, they believed and obeyed God with the self-sacrificing disposition afterwards evinced in Abraham; that their faith was counted to them for righteousness; that they succumbed to death even as men; that they rose from the dead, and so attained to incorruptibility and immortality as Elohim of the Invisible God. If "angels desire to look into" the things pertaining to the exaltation of our race, we may without sin desire "to look into" the things belonging to their's. Our mundane system is but a pattern of things that were in the heavens before their perfection; and probably of what even now obtains in other planets in relation to other beings, who, like ourselves, have not yet progressed beyond the animal and probationary era of their history. *Our* Angels or Elohim, those, we mean, of the Heavenly Hosts, to whose superintendence terrestrial affairs are consigned until the Lord Jesus shall assume the reins of government; not all the Elohims, but those of them thus defined, for of these only are we speaking now—"always behold the face of God," and minister his will towards the sons of men. This is their glory apart of their reward. He sent them to form and fill the earth with living souls. They did it according to his purpose. Reader, behold the consummation! Mortal and corruptible beings like ourselves, become Elohim, mighty in strength, and creators of worlds, of which the Planet we inhabit is a grand and glorious specimen. Behold, then, the destiny set before those who shall become "equal to the Angels" by a resurrection unto eternal life."

This criticism fully establishes the position I at first stated. I consider it absolutely unanswerable. I regard this as a full reply to all you have said about the image and nature of man being like "the only living and true God."

9th. I admit *not* your "whole conclusion," as an endorsation of the above criticism will show. You are too hasty in your conclusions for me to admit them.

10th. Your remarks on 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, contain nothing new, and nothing "I care to notice," seeing my argument is entirely untouched.

11th. My remarks on Paul's Vision are unanswered.

12th. Paul *does not* say it would be "gain to him," personally, "to die;" but the whole context shows that my exposition is correct—CHRIST AND HIS TRUTH WOULD BE MAGNIFIED. Paul was in a strait between choosing life or death, but there was a *third* thing, in relation to which he was in no "strait;" and that was "*the returning and being with Christ.*" You do not, I think, understand the Apostle.

McNight is a good translator, but I rely on no man's authority in matters of faith. God's word is my only infallible standard. And if we would study His word more, and theological authors less, we would soon learn more than they all.

13th. Well, I suppose your next effort will be Dives and Lazarus, for I know all the arguments on your side, having used them once myself!

14th. But, kind sir, let me give you a few passages to work upon in your next.

1. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. cxv. 17.

2. "For the living know that they shall die; *but the dead know not any thing*," &c. See also, Ps. lxxxviii. 10, 11 and 12.

3. "Put not your trust in Princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish.*" Ps. cxlvi. 4. See also, Isaiah xxxviii. 17, 18, 19.

Heretofore you have presented difficulties; I now present a few; will you please to remove them?

Yours, truly,
J. T. WALSH.

FUTURE STATES.

Their Evidences and Nature Considered on Principles Physical, Moral and Scriptural, With the Design of showing the Value of the Gospel Revelation.

BY REV. REGINALD COURTENAY, M. A.
Rector of Thornton Watlass, Yorkshire.

Such is the title of a book we have received from England. The first half is devoted to showing the utter insufficiency of the "Arguments" built upon the "Indivisibility of Mind—Man's Physical Superiority—the Sufferance of Evil—the Greatness of human Desires—the Perfectibility of the Species—and from Moral Derangement" to prove man's immortality, or even a Future State, at all. Having thus prepared the way to show the value of the Gospel Revelation he proceeds to the consideration of the Revelations of the Scripture, of which the following is the first of a series of extracts we shall place in the Examiner for the profit of our readers, premising that we do not endorse every phrase, or sentiment contained in them; but as a whole they are exceedingly valuable and interesting.

IMMORTALITY BEGUN IN SPIRITUAL LIFE.

When the Creating Word covered the earth with trees and plants, each was ordained to bear its seed within itself, after its kind, that so, while the first individuals of each species decayed, the species itself should be perpetuated. And we find that through the endless variety of the vegetable creation, the same law of reproduction is preserved, and though some are capable of propagation otherwise than by seeds, in all cases the life of the offspring is nothing more than a detached portion of the life of the parent plant. And thus vegetable life is, generally speaking, an immortal life, and appears to be as vigorous now, as it was in the earliest age. Yet there is only a conditional immortality; certain species of plants have become ex-

tinct, and their former existence is known only by their fossil remains. And the same law of reproduction, the same kind of perpetual life, is found in animals; among whom the life of the young is in the fullest sense, and exactly in the same way as in vegetables, the life of the parents.

And we have very great reason to believe that the law of decay and reproduction prevailed from the very first; and before the transgression of Adam, throughout the whole inferior and organized creation. For there is no reason to think that only a few individuals of each species were created, as in the case of man; and that the reproductive principle was primarily intended only for the replenishment of the earth. The waters brought forth *abundantly* the moving creature that had life, and fowl to fly above the earth in the open expanse of heaven; nor need we doubt that the earth also brought forth, in equal profusion, the herb yielding seed, the cattle and creeping thing. All were *alike* intended to increase and multiply, not only in order to fill the earth, which could have easily been effected at once by the Almighty Word, but to repair the ravages of decay.

That the green herb, at least, was to perish may be concluded from the circumstance that it formed the earliest appointed food of man, and of the lower animals. An irresistible analogy compels us to believe that such mortality was the condition of *all* created things, man himself not excepted, unless we shall find in Scripture, to which alone reference is now to be made, special reasons for exempting him.

Now Adam was originally, like all other animals a creature of dust, and, as has been observed in another place, the "breath of life" breathed into his nostrils was merely that of animal life, for it was also breathed into the nostrils of every living creature that moved upon the face of the earth. A Paradise, or garden of Eden, was planted by the hand of the Lord, who "there put the man whom he had made;" not forbidding him to "eat of the fruit of the Tree of Life." But Adam transgressed; and he was expelled from Paradise, and that speedily, "lest he should put forth his hand, and take of the Tree of Life, and eating live for ever." When he thus lost the Divine favour, and was deprived of all super-natural aid, it was made known to him that *his originally animal nature would subject him to decay;* that henceforth he must, like other creatures, maintain his life by his own exertions, and be exposed, as the originally necessary condition of terrestrial existence beyond Paradise, to sickness and pain, decay and death. "Cursed is the ground for thy sake, thorns also and thistles it shall bring forth to thee,—which yet, for any thing revealed to the contrary, it may have brought forth *before*, though not for Adam,—in the sweat of the face shalt though eat bread, *until thou return to the ground; for out of it thou wast taken;* FOR DUST THOU ART AND UNTO DUST THOU SHALT RETURN." This does not appear to be merely a Fall, like that which attended the expulsion of the rebel angels from heaven; but rather a natural relapse, like the sinking of the apostle Peter, when, appalled by the fury of the waves, his faith failed him.

Now we here maintain, and seek to prove from the New Testament, that man has not, and never had, any principle of perpetual life, other than that which belongs also to the inferior creation, except by the special grace and mercy of God. That he inherits nothing of the kind from his parents, nor receives it as a birth-right when he comes into the world; and can obtain it only *by means of Regeneration.** Many persons deem that to be true of the human soul—of the more excellent part, or according to them, the "only essential" part of the natural man—which is, as we maintain, true only of the Divine Spirit that enlivens the hearts of the regenerate. And these persons commonly draw a distinction between the mind, which they allow to be changeable and perishable, and the soul, which they consider to be in itself immortal. This distinction, however, directly militates against the Scriptural doctrine of original or birth sin. For were the soul or spiritual part, or whatever else it is to be called, essentially distinct from the mind, the intellectual, the corporeal, or animal parts, and did it exist independently of them, by right of its own nature, unaffected by their mutations, being a possession for ever, as they would represent it, with which every man is endowed at his birth, and which forms an original and essential part of the human nature, it would follow unavoidably that this immortal part of man, this soul, would *not* partake of the corruption, which by corporeal descent "naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam," according to the ninth Article of our Church, and according to the whole spirit and tenour of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament. The law of corruption pervades the whole nature of every soul of man: a fact which is of itself a sufficient proof that the whole nature comes by inheritance, is an off-shoot, a thing naturally engendered. The whole nature: for "the first *man*," the whole nature or the offspring of Adam, "is of the earth, earthy," a thing according to the declaration of St. Paul, altogether "mortal," and "corruptible:" "the second man is the Lord from heaven." And there is no third nature, nothing appertaining to humanity, which comes not either through Adam or through Christ, no spiritual or immortal part, therefore, except in those who have part in Him. Men may be impelled by self love to explain away such passages as declare their natural worthlessness; to deny that we are *altogether* creatures of dust, inheritors of corruption, doomed to return to the earth, from which, through Adam, we all derive our being. But the doctrine of regeneration proves, that these passages are literally and distinctly true. For it is not enough that the nature of the old man should be *purified*, that flesh and blood should be sanctified, that sin should be pardoned; the doing away of the old man would leave—nothing: FRESH LIFE must be given from above: and it is given not to all men, nor at the period of natural birth, but to those who, by being born again, "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit," become members of Christ. To exhibit this most important truth in its full extent, and in all the relations which a reverent and earnest study of Scripture may suggest, would require a separate volume: all that can be done in this place is, briefly to notice the principle texts and reasonings by which it may be established.

Scripture notices two principles as influencing the human will,—the flesh and the spirit. To

* The word being employed here in that wider sense which includes all who, under any dispensation, have been moved by the Holy Spirit.

walk after the flesh is to sin, to walk after the spirit, is to please God. Now they who walk after the Spirit, it is clear from Scripture, are not obeying the dictates of a purified human nature, nor, as some suppose, of a particular part of it, namely of a "soul" or human spirit, which, once freed from the taint of original sin, is capable of guiding them aright, but of a higher principle, a Spirit extrinsic, superhuman, Divine. Even the Son of God, in whom dwelt no sin, who, though partaking of humanity, was in every part of his nature spotless and pure, thus declared concerning himself: "The Son can do *nothing* of himself, but what he seeth the Father do, for what thing soever he doeth, these also doth the Son likewise. * * * As the Father hath life in himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself. * * * It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth *nothing*, the words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life. * * * As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. * * * This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the Last Day.† * * * I am the true vine. * * * As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. *Without me ye can do nothing.* If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

St. Paul bears ample testimony to the same vital truths. To the Romans, (chapter viii.) he says, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you—If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life becanse of righteousness." And (1 Corinth. ii.) "What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him: even so the things of God knoweth *no man, but the Spirit of God;*" [for the natural man receiveth them not.] And (Galatians ii.) "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet *not I, but Christ liveth in me.*" And many other passages to the same effect might be adduced: none, most certainly, to a contrary effect. Throughout the whole of Scripture not the slightest hint can be found of the existence, in the human nature, of any immaterial part which is not fleshly and corrupt in itself. There is no third nature, we repeat, in addition to the "first man," which is of the earth and earthy, and the second man which is the Lord from heaven.

But here a difficulty may appear to arise. If men are born of the Spirit in this world, if they receive now a nature which is not earthly, surely this nature must survive the decay of the first or natural man; and then the regenerate, though not the unregenerate, would become possessed of immortal souls. "The Scripture hath taught us that there are two principles in the Christian, distinguished by the names of the outward and the inward man, the latter of which may be increasing in vigour, while the former is hastening to its dissolution. The inward principle is that which is born again in baptism; and being born of God is of a divine nature. Consequently whatever may be said for or against the natural immortality of the soul, this principle cannot be subject to death in common with that nature which is born of the flesh."* To this it may be sufficient to reply, that we have no reason to know or believe that this divine principle *can* subsist at all, as a separate, personal, individual thing, except in union with the conscious soul; but we should rather think that it does, and must of necessity, return—in a higher sense than the mere breath returns,—to God who gave it; and subsist just as it did before that human soul which it inspired was called into being. And had our Blessed Lord retained this spirit when in the grave, he would not have "commended it to his Father's hands," at the hour of his death.

[To be continued.]

† Raise up then surely something more precious than the bodies of His saints.

* Jones' Dissertations, Vol. ii.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, FEB., 1849.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

To Correspondents:—We should be glad if we had room to give every one an opportunity to say whatever he might think important. We have not the vacuum to fill up that a weekly paper has; and therefore are more likely to be thought negligent to our correspondents than such papers. We have many good things on hand from our friends that would be pleasant to publish; and our full share of commendation of the paper; which, however, we doubt the propriety of making public. We have once in a while a little fault finding, though no one says "stop my paper," for we forestalled such by declining to send the Examiner to any who have not paid in advance: so that all our communications come *smiling*, and we know who wishes to read the paper; though they do not, and are not expected to agree with all they find in it. We are not so foolish as to expect they will; nor are they so unwise as to wish that we should withhold everything they do not see clear, or which they may think erroneous. One says, I do not like your views on the subject of probation after the advent, and the return of the Jews: Another says, give us more of the Jew question, &c. *We* have said the great question is, The Immortality Question: that lays at the foundation of every other gospel truth. Upon the settling of that, turns the whole character of the gospel salvation. Other questions we shall discuss more or less, as we find place. We have thought to lay aside our own articles to make room for others. When we do so, some tell us to give them more from our own pen; and nearly all are pleased with our *Associate*. We are glad of that, and hope that great grace may be upon him.

Dobney on Future Punishment.—We have not been able to get this work forward as fast as we ex-

pected; but it will be forthcoming soon. Some have already sent us orders and money for it; and we know they cannot do better than to circulate it. It will be a feast to those who love the truths it contains. We intended to have made larger extracts from it for the Examiner, but are crowded for room. Having much in other works received from England that we desire to publish, we shall have to let our friends gratify themselves with Dobney by purchasing the work. Price 75 cents, bound; or, 50 in paper covers. When six or more copies are taken, one-third discount will be allowed. Any person sending ten dollars, or more, immediately, shall have the amount in Dobney, at the first cost of the work, whatever it may be.

Hymn Book.—If the friends of truth do not wish to sing about "never-dying souls"—"endless misery"—"flying above the skies," and a thousand other traditions of men, then help us furnish a book out of which this old leaven is purged. Br. Walsh has been laboring to prepare a small Hymn Book with this object; not new hymns, but a selection, mostly from old ones, intended to correspond with man's natural condition and prospects, as clearly announced in the scriptures of truth. But while we know that such a Hymn Book is needed, we have not the funds to publish it: it would be put into the hands of the compositor immediately if we had. It is designed to be about 200 pages, 24 mo.; and the price will not vary much from 25 cents per copy bound, or 20 cents in paper covers. Will those who wish such a work tell us how many they will take and pay for when ready for delivery? We put down Philadelphia for at least, *one hundred* copies.

Randolph E. Ladd, Springfield, Mass. 50 copies.

As soon as one thousand copies are pledged, the the work will be put to press. Please speak out on this matter.

To Accommodate those who wish the Bible Examiner and our six sermons, we make the following *offer*, to continue till revoked. For each dollar current money, sent us free of expense, we will send one copy of the Examiner one year, and *six* copies of the "Six Sermons, 18 mo.," which includes also our views on the State of the Dead, with the tract "Rich man and Lazarus:" or, instead of these, we will send twenty copies of the six sermons, quarto 16 pages; but this does not include the tract: or, in place of the sermons, we will send *three* copies of "Walsh's Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation," &c., without covers, and a little soiled, though all perfectly readable.

British Dominions:—We are obliged to pre-pay postage on all papers we send there; besides, we have to pay postage on all letters received from there, and a discount of five per cent on foreign bills. To illustrate: A friend in the British Dominions sends us a dollar bill: he wants two copies of the Examiner for one year. We have to pay postage on his letter, 10 cents; discount on bill, five cents; and then pre-pay postage on the papers for the year, thirty-six cents; thus, 10–5–36 is 51 cents; leaving us less than one-half the subscription price for the paper. We only state the facts, and leave it with the friends there to do as they think right.

"The Doctrines you advocate are taking root more extensively than you may be aware of." So writes an eminent Methodist preacher to us, whose name, at present, we are not at liberty to give.

THE PERFECTION OF ADAM;

Or, His Knowledge and Holiness.

The extravagant manner in which this point has been set forth by nearly all theologians, we are disposed to think, is not sustained by either the works or words of God. Adam has been represented as the very perfection of knowledge and holiness at his creation. The facts stated in regard to his creation are so few, that from those alone we might be left in doubt as to Adam's perfection as an intelligent and moral being; yet we shall find by observing God's order in his works in connection with revelation the real state of Adam at creation.

God's works have always been progressive.

Or, as Tertullian says—"In the Creator's universe all things occur in the order of gradual developement, each in its proper place." That is—Whatever God has accomplished, so far as known to us, has ever been by a gradual developement and a steady accumulation from a lesser to a greater. The work of creation was not accomplished in a day; but, from the first movement of "the Spirit of God upon the face of the deep," each succeeding day gave birth to some new developement in the process of formation; every day increasing in interest by the addition of some increasing perfection; though every part of the work was perfect in its kind for the designed object or use. We stop not here to inquire whether the materials of which the earth was formed had been in a process of accumulation for untold ages prior to the Spirit moving upon the mass to bring order and arrangement out of that which was "without form and void"—it might have been so without at all affecting the accuracy of the Mosaic account of creation—but the fact that the actual production of the "heavens and the earth" was by a gradual process is undeniable.

The revelation that God has seen fit to make to men has always been gradual and progressive: all was not revealed at once; and what has been communicated, as prophecy, has had a gradual and progressive developement and accomplishment. Take Abraham as an example. First, he is called to "get out of" his "own country"—then he is shown "a land" that is promised him—a son of

promise is presented to his mind, Isaac—he learns his seed is to be in bondage 400 years—after that to be brought into the land of Canaan—that from him was to proceed *a seed* in whom "all the families of the earth were to be blessed"—that his posterity should be as the stars of heaven for multitude, &c. All these things in their accomplishment were gradual and progressive, occupying many centuries, and are to have still further developements before the greatest perfection is attained contemplated in these providential works of God.

What is true in the case just contemplated, is true in the general course of God's dealings with men. The Fetus does not come to maturity to be ushered into the world in a day; and when the child is born how slow the process by which even its physical nature arrives at maturity; equally gradual and progressive is the developement of its mind and mental energy. Improvements in the arts and sciences, on which side soever we look, and in all departments, are gradual. Many of those improvements are the work of ages; others are brought forward more rapidly. A single thought at first set the train in motion that has resulted in mighty developements, which have astonished, delighted, or benefitted mankind. It were easy to trace out a multitude of particulars, but to the reflecting mind this is unnecessary—it will readily call them up.

THE CREATION OF MAN.

Where is the evidence that God acted contrary to what is, evidently, his established order in the Creation and Developement of Man? In other words—Where is the evidence that Adam was, at the first period of his existence, such an intellectual and moral giant as the current theology makes him? We are persuaded there is more fancy and assumption than proof of any such giant-like knowledge and holiness as has been attributed to him. It appears to us these assumptions have grown out of that misanthropic spirit which takes delight in maligning Adam's posterity under the pretence of honoring God, and has been the prolific parent of hatred to our fellow men, instead of that love which God requires; and its tendency is to produce despair in the minds of men of ever attaining to that knowledge and holiness which God requires.

ADAM'S PHYSICAL STATURE.

On this point we can say but little; but, reasoning from the analogy of the works of God we have no reason to suppose it was any more perfect, at the first moment of creation, than that of any other perfectly healthy *child*. "Adam a *child!*" I hear one say—"Who nursed him and brought him up?" Answer—God, his Father; probably, by the ministration of angels, who are sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation: Heb. 1: 14. "Adam (was the Son of God." See Luke 3: 38. As such, God took care of him, and brought him forward in the maturity designed for his physical nature.

ADAM'S INTELLECTUAL NATURE.

We can see no reason for departing from the analogy of God's works on this point. His intellect was gradually developed, most likely, like any other child's. The animal, or physical, first appears—then, gradually maturing, the intellect commences its developement, with *one idea* or thought at a time. Up to the time Adam took the forbidden fruit he is, evidently, very imperfect in the developement of intellect. But, says one, "he must have been very wise and knowing, for he gave names to all the cattle, &c." What if he did—does that prove him a giant in knowledge? We know it is said, he gave them names descriptive of their natures, but we know, also, that such a position is a mere *assumption* without proof. Who can tell, now, what name Adam gave to one of the "living creatures"? And if they could, how can it be proved that that name is any more descriptive of its nature than any other name? Parents now delight to try the intellect of their little children; and it not unfrequently happens that these little prattlers give some very odd names to some things, and their parents delighted with this effort to use intellect often adopt the name the child has given to an object; and for a time will use the odd name with much merriment, because it proves to them an opening mind, and this gives them joy. This circumstance of Adam's giving names to beasts, &c., is but a sorry proof of his being such an anomaly in knowledge as our modern theology represents him to have been.

ADAM'S IGNORANCE.

On the other hand his ignorance is notorious. He was too ignorant to know he was "naked;" for he was naked and was "not ashamed." Why was he not ashamed? You may say, "because he was innocent:" but, that was not all—he did *not know* he was naked; see Gen. 3: 7; he was ignorant, like other children, who, to some years, have no more shame than Adam had, and for a similar reason—they have never been taught it; and their intellects are not enough developed to discover it. Further, Adam was so ignorant that he did not know the difference between good and evil. It is useless to say, he could not have known this without he had sinned; for God knew that difference, as is evident from his language, Gen. 8: 22, "the man has become as *one of* us to *know* good and evil." This language is further proof that Adam had been too ignorant to discern between them, previously. But God had that knowledge without having sinned; and, at a proper time, doubtless, would have communicated it to man, had he been obedient and waited the gradual and progressive order established by his Creator; and thus would have attained that knowledge without the evil that attended his neglect to heed his Maker's instruction. Again—"Adam was a figure," or type, "of him that was to come"; see Rom. 5: 14, and compare with 1 Corth. 15: 45. The Second Adam was the anti-type. Did the type come into the world with more knowledge than the anti-type? Jesus was a child—for a time helpless—without knowledge; for the child Jesus *grew*—and *increased in wisdom* and stature, and in favor with God and man": Luke 2: 40, 52. Shall we admit these things of Adam the second and deny them of Adam the first?

ADAM'S HOLINESS.

As on Adam's knowledge the most extravagant notions have been assumed, so in regard to his holiness the most unbounded descriptions have been given of its extent, and how it pervaded his entire being, regulating all his faculties, members, and senses; so that he has been made to appear as

the sum of all perfection, and a perfect giant in moral life and power. All this has been done, doubtless, thinking to honor God, and the better to show off what monsters in depravity Adam's posterity are. Such persons never seem to have once thought in what a ridiculous light their view places the Creator of Adam; and how perfectly irreconcileable such theory is with the easy victory temptation had over him. Did his Creator make him a giant in holiness, and then suppose there would be any temptation, in the midst of unbounded enjoyment, by simply directing him not to eat of a solitary tree? The idea is supremely absurd—thousands of his posterity have withstood and overcome temptations far greater than that by which Adam fell. Adam at creation had no *moral* character—he was *neither* holy nor unholy. There is not one word said of Adam's being holy at his creation. The same is said of him that is said of all the other works of God—he was "*very good*"—the same is said of "*every thing* God had made"; see Gen. 1: 31; but not one word is said of the holiness of any of them. Holiness is a *relative* term, and presupposes action towards some other being, preceded by knowledge and understanding, based on choice. Without this there cannot be either holiness or unholiness in any created thing. We conceive that all the talk about Adam's holiness is mere "patch work"—designed to patch up the work of God, but has only shown the pride of men's hearts in desiring to "be as God." Adam was a "very good" *animal*, of the highest order—designed to be king, or to have dominion, over all the others; and possessed with those more perfect faculties which made him capable of developing a moral nature, or of manifesting moral actions, by certain appliances called a command, law, or prohibition. Without such command, law, or prohibition, there could have been no developement of moral nature, or character; and man would have only remained the *highest of animals*, and like them remained very good, but without the character of holiness or unholiness, for the very sufficient reason, there was nothing to develope such a relative quality.

That Adam was a mere animal, at creation, is further evident from the account of creation; Gen. 2: 7—"The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground," &c.; and verse 19, "Out of the ground the Lord God formed every *beast* of the field, and every *fowl* of the air," &c. These last the Lord caused to pass before Adam, to see what he would call them, at the time when he proposed to make Adam "a help meet," or a companion suitable for him: among none of them was such a help meet to be found. Adam was superior to them all, and designed to be their lord; Gen. 1: 26; yet, he had the same origin, *viz.* from the dust of the ground, with such an organization as gave him faculties for higher developements, and capable of moral manifestations; or, capable of attaining unto *holiness*. "The first Adam was made a *living soul*"; 1 Corth. 15: 45; *not* "an *immortal* soul"—that error lies at the root of all other corruptions of the Scriptures and the truth of God. The honor of making man an immortal being was reserved for the *second* Adam—he it is that is "made a *quickening* spirit," or through and by whom any man can attain to immortality; 1 Corth. 15: 45—49.

Adam then was first developed, if we may use that phrase, *an animal*, with an *aptitude* to attain knowledge superior to any other animal; and herein was to consist the "*image* of God" in which he was created; as appears from Col. 3: 10—"Renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:" *not*, renewed in knowledge after the image of Adam; but, after the *image* of Adam's *Creator*. Adam, himself, after being formed of the dust of the ground, needed and was designed to have this renewal [this *renovo—to make new*] in knowledge after the image of his Maker. Adam therefore did not "lose the image of God," as the current theology teaches; and for which teaching there is not one word of authority from Genesis to Revelation; nor did he lose holiness, for he had none to lose prior to his trial; till then his moral nature was not developed—till then he was very good, in common with the animals and other works of God, but was no more holy than the beasts of the field were holy: he could not therefore actually lose what he did not really possess. He did possess a *capacity* for holiness; that capacity he did not lose by his disobedience; but, it developed itself in a wrong direction—it now, for the first time, became *manifest* that he possessed such a power—he now, for the first time, discovered himself in possession of a moral nature—he now, for the first time, came to know the difference between good and evil—he knew not the one from the other previously; but now, said God, "the man is *become as one of us*, to know good and evil"—has attained to a knowledge that exhibits the *image* of God: he has indeed attained to it by an improper course; but still he has attained it. But, says one, "Adam lost knowledge." So speaks the current theology; but, it is to give God the lie, and charge the God of truth with uttering a falsehood: God declared he had *gained* knowledge. Who is this that blasphemeth his Maker by affirming the contrary. But, continues the objector, "it is evident that Adam lost knowledge, for he attempted to hide himself among the trees of the garden, which he would not have done if he had not lost the knowledge of God's omnipresence." This is another pure assumption. Where is the evidence that Adam ever had the knowledge of God's omnipresence? Or, that any such knowledge had ever been communicated to him? There is none—he seems to have regarded God as any child regards his father; and when he is conscious he has been doing wrong he is afraid to see his father, and strives to hide himself: just so Adam acted, and for the same reason—*viz.* "*shame*."

ADAM'S TEMPTATION.

Many people murmur and complain about Adam's Temptation; they seem at a loss to know which to blame most, Adam or his Maker. They might as well complain that we had not all been left to grovel in the region of the animal appetites, with no capacity for higher and God-like attainments. We have already shown that to develope moral qualities, or to bring out *holiness*—which is but another word for *self-government*—there must be trial of some sort. God adapted the trial to Adam's *weakness* and IGNORANCE—he gave him the least possible trial that could have been used to develope a moral nature at all, or to test man as to his capacity of self-government. If he could not govern himself, he could not govern the creation at the head of which his Maker designed to place

him, in dominion. We say, the prohibition out of which the trial was to grow, and which proved the occasion of his temptation, was the very least it could be. Look at it—Man's intellectual nature was not yet developed. His Maker therefore adapted his enjoyments to his present capacity—or animal nature—by causing "every tree to grow out of the ground that is *pleasant to the sight* and *good for food*," &c. In the delightful garden in Eden he placed man, with full and unrestrained liberty to regale and enjoy himself to the utmost extent of his present capacity, with but *one* solitary restriction. How very trifling this. There was no want of means for enjoyment. The restriction was designed for his advantage, by leading him to develope and form a moral character, and learn self-government, which would open up a new, more noble, and God-like source of happiness and enjoyment. In this view the restriction was one of love and good will. If man's moral nature could be developed, and a character of holiness established by this easy test or trial, God determined it should be; but if that failed to bring out a holy moral character he determined to place him under a course of discipline more severe, *viz.*, that of labor in sorrow, and death; and at the same time, to the favor already bestowed upon man, to add a "*much more* abundant" supply of aid to attain unto holiness, through the blessings to be bestowed in another dispensation, to be immediately opened if man failed in the present trial. "Oh, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God," and also of his goodness and love to man!

We here stop to ask—How is it possible that moral character can be known or developed without trial in some form? For example—How can it be known that a man is a temperance man, and able to govern himself in reference to inebriating drink, if he has never had a trial? To try him, would you put that drink under bars and bolts that it was impossible for him to break? If such a course could be called a trial, you might try him fifty years, and both he and yourself would be just as ignorant at the end of that period as at its commencement as to his capacity for self-government; and he, on that point, would not be a particle more holy than the first day of that period. To bring out and fix a moral character, in that respect, he must have access to the liquor; but you, as a benevolent man, if he was ignorant of the fact, would warn him that if he did indulge his taste to any extent, intoxication and shame would follow. Thus situated, denying himself, or practising self-government, would be a virtue, and he would, by every victory over the temptation, have a new consciousness that he was capable of governing himself, and a renewed evidence of the exalted character of manhood, and thus be led to a higher and more holy estimate of the excellency and glory of that being who had created him with such powers, or capacities. If in the supposed case the person should fail of self-government, and partake the inebriating liquor, the intoxication and consequent shame that follows his failure are a *mercy;* because calculated to arouse him to an effort to gain a temperance character, the importance of which he may now see more than before.

Apply this illustration to the case of Adam. A moral character, holiness, or self-government, could not have existed, in fact, without trial; and that would have been no trial which had placed it out of his power to act wrong. The least trial that could be employed was first used, with the information beforehand that if that failed to produce a holy moral character, man would be *subjected* to a much more severe trial, *viz.*, "*dying to die*"—implying sorrow, suffering, and labor, to wind up in "DEATH."

ADAM'S FAILURE.

Adam failed of bringing out a holy character in his first trial. That is no proof of any defect in his constitution, or creation; or of any moral depravity previous to that time; nor did that "*ruin*" either Adam or his posterity, as the self-styled orthodoxy affirms; nor, bring "the wrath of God upon him," or them. True, he and they were "subjected to vanity, [or, suffering and death,] not willingly, but by reason [or, in the wisdom] of him who hath subjected the same in hope," and in promise of deliverance from that death by a second Adam, the seed of the woman. All the acts of God towards Adam, after his sin, manifest *mercy*, not wrath. He told them, indeed, that they must now be put under that severer discipline of which he had informed them; and be subjected to sorrow, labor, and death; but at the same time spoke to them words of encouragement and hope: he also provided for their clothing, and guarded them against inflicting upon themselves the curse of immortality in sin, by removing them away from the tree of life; which, instead of being a curse, was a blessing; that they might not by any possible means inflict upon themselves an immortality in sin. Thus the notion that Adam died a moral death is proved to be a mere outburst of a distempered imagination: he never had a moral life before he sinned: he had only animal life: the death to which he was subjected was only animal, and neither moral nor intellectual: he did not "lose the favor of God;" but, God in wisdom, and for man's good, put him under a severer discipline, as parents often do their children, and that *in love* and the most tender pity and good will. How is God—the God of love—often dishonored by the representations of his dealings with our first parents and their posterity because of their failure. No wonder men are made infidels by such blasphemous insinuations—no wonder men bewilder themselves, and are lost in the fancies which grow out of their absurd and contradictory theories. The most blasphemous part of all is, that the God of Truth and Love is represented as causing Adam's posterity to inherit a morally depraved nature, "whereby they are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and that continually:"—*Assembly's Catechism.* When will such reproach of God our Maker have an end? "Oh, let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end;"—*Psalmist. Immortal-soulism,* what hast thou done? Blasphemed God—both deified and devilized man—exalted Satan—reviled the Bible—fed infidelity—nourished and brought up Universalism—robbed Christ—filled the world with hate and hypocrites. This hast thou done—"ignorantly, in unbelief," we hope. Let men learn to call their sins their own, and acknowledge the long-suffering and love of God, till they shall both hate their sins and abandon them, from a deep conviction of the amazing wrong they have done to God by living contrary to that course his

love and kindness has marked out for us, that we might attain "unto holiness, and that the end might be everlasting life, through Jesus Christ," the Son of God, and our Saviour.

EXPOSITION OF SCRIPTURE.

We purpose giving occasionally an exposition of some chapters of the Bible, in a connected manner. We commence with the first chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.

VERSE 1.—"Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus."

An apostle is a special messenger. The apostles of our Lord were messengers sent by him *personally;* and, so far as we can now see, we are inclined to the opinion that no man can sustain that relation to Christ, who has not personally "*seen*" him, and been appointed by him. Thus, when Saul of Tarsus was to be called to that high office, the "Lord Jesus *appeared* to him," and declared, "I am Jesus," and announced that he now gave him a special commission to "go unto the Gentiles." Paul afterwards tells us he had "*seen* the Lord," as well as the other apostles; 1. Corth. 15: 4—8. He was therefore a special messenger of the Anointed Saviour, and this "by the will of God:" not by man, nor of man; but, by the purpose of God.

The term "*saints,*" in this verse, signifies *holy,* and relates to what they were by profession and calling—"called to be saints," or holy: Rom. 1: 7. That is what the gospel of Christ calls men to; and a profession of obedience to the gospel is a profession of consecration to holiness by Jesus Christ, or through *union* to him as the branch is united to the vine, or the body to the head, whereby it partakes of the same spirit or life; hence, abiding in Christ, necessarily become holy, or saints.

"To the faithful [Greek-*Pistois—true—firm in adherence*] in Christ." The apostle thus shows that we are not only to be *in* Christ as the branch is in the vine, but we are to be firm in our adherence to him if we would be holy or attain the blessings of which he speaks afterwards.

VERSE 2.—"Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

"*Grace*" [*Gr. Charis*] signifies not only *favour,* but *joy—gladness.* He wished them joy and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. True joy is one of the blessings arising from a faithful adherence to Christ, and a gracious result of it. Though sorrowful, because in a land of trial and suffering, yet always rejoicing in the blessed hope of which we shall soon speak.

VERSE 3.—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

"*Blessed*" [*Gr. Eulogetos—Worthy of praise* is] the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and who is thus the God and Father of all those who *adhere* to Jesus our Lord; as saith the Saviour—"I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God:" John 20: 17. "Who hath blessed [*Eulogia*—may be read, *conferred* on] us all spiritual blessings," &c. There are blessings that relate to our *physical* natures, or our bodies; and mental blessings, which relate to our intellect. Each of these may be possessed and enjoyed in a large measure while the spiritual blessings, which relate to our moral or religious nature, are wanting. The order of man's development is first our physical or animal nature; and blessings are provided suitable thereto by our Heavenly Father. Next is developed our mental or intellectual nature, with an ample field of blessings spread before it; but, there is not in all these blessings, any thing suited to that higher development which our Creator designs to bring out in us, which we denominate, a spiritual nature, and without which no man can see the kingdom of God, or enter into it. Most men content themselves with the development and gratification of their animal nature—what shall we eat—what shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed? is their chief inquiry and concern. The next class, which is far less, content themselves with the development and gratification of their intellectual nature. The philosophy of the works of creation, and the things they can reach by the mere power of intellect, occupy and delight them; but they stop short of the development of that spiritual nature which unites man to God, and makes him a "partaker of the divine nature," [2 Pet. 1: 4,] and without which no man can attain to eternal life, because he has no principle of eternal life in himself, however lofty his intellect. It is only by a union to Christ, and receiving that spirit which dwells in him, without measure, that there can be developed this spiritual nature, with the "spiritual understanding" essential to the attainment of immortality—eternal life, or a part in the kingdom of God. These "spiritual blessings" God blesses us with "IN *Christ,*" as saith the text: *out* of him they are not attainable by any soul of man, however wise, moral, or virtuous he may account himself, or may be accounted by others; but, *in* Christ—actually united to him, as the branch to the vine, and adhering to him—we are "blessed with all spiritual blessings."

VERSE 4.—"According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love."

This verse expresses the purpose of God before the creation of man, that the development of the spiritual nature of man, and its perfection in order to eternal life, should be *in* Christ, and not by natural generation: the most that proceeds from natural generation is an *intellectual animal;* it remains for spiritual generation to bring forth a spiritual nature; and this is no *new* purpose of God, but he made choice, before the world began, that it should be attained only in and through Christ: thus, and thus *only,* according to God's purpose, or choice, can any man become "holy and without blame before him in love." This holiness and unblamable love is the property or characteristic only of a spiritual nature. The choice of God, then, relates to the *manner* in which any man should attain that condition in which he "should be holy and without blame before him in love;" which state or condition is essential to the high calling expressed in the next verse.

VERSE 5.—"Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will."

"Having predestinated *us*"—*who?* We, who are *holy,* &c., as expressed in the previous verse:

not particular *persons;* but, particular *characters*—clearly expressed. "Predestinated us" to what? "Unto the adoption of children," &c. Such as attain the character expressed, God, beforehand, determined to *adopt* as children to himself. This "adoption" is no work done in us nor for us in this life. No man can be a child of God by adoption till he puts on immortality—incorruptibility. Here many "professing themselves to be wise, become fools; and change the glory of the *incorruptible* God into an image made like corruptible man:" Rom. 1: 22, 23. Men may be children of God now *by faith*, (Gal. 3: 26;) that is by anticipation: for faith is the substance of things *hoped* for, [not now in possession,] the evidence of things not seen: Heb. 11: 1. The saints, or those who are now holy and without blame in love, are children of God by *faith*—or anticipation—but to have the *adoption* of children, or to be the children of God by adoption, is another and a very different matter. What! a "corruptible man" *now* an adopted child of "the incorruptible God!" The idea is one of the greatest absurdity, and has only grown out of the foundation error of all the corruptions of Christianity, viz: the idea that man has in him an immortal soul. The adoption of children is future. "We," apostles and other Christians, "groan within ourselves, *waiting* for the adoption, to wit: *the redemption of our body*:" Rom. 8: 23. They which shall be accounted worthy to attain that world, *and* the resurrection from the dead, can die no more, "and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection," Lk. 20: 35, 36. It is then, and not till then, that any attain to the adoption of children to God; and none then, only those who are found "holy and without blame before him in love." Solemn truth. May it press upon our minds with the weight its eternal importance demands.

This adoption is "according to the good pleasure of God's will," and is "*by* Jesus Christ." It is not of natural generation, nor by our merit, nor of necessity the result of reconciliation to God; but, of his own free will and favor.

Verse 6.—"To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved."

"The glory of God's grace," is his favour in Christ, manifested by the gospel; a glorious dispensation of mercy, which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth" in that mercy, or God's purpose of adopting as children all that become holy and without blame before him in love: by which gospel "he hath made" all that believe *now* "accepted in the beloved"—Jesus Christ.

Verse 7.—"In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."

In whom [in the beloved] we have [this redemption [viz.: the adoption of children] through his blood [his incarnation—forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and *blood*, he also took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage: Heb. 2: 14, 15.] His blood, here then, we think, relates not merely to his shedding his blood for us, but rather his uniting with the race of man by the blood that flowed from Adam, the first, so that he was truly a partaker of our mortal nature, and thus became man with men; and having shed that blood he had in common with men, though he never sinned, God raised him up from the dead by his Spirit; thus conferring on "the *man*, Christ Jesus"—the second Adam—the *adoption* of Son, by another principle of life than blood, *viz.:* the Spirit; so that "he dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him," [Rom. 6: 9;] thus, as by "blood" he became related to the whole human family, and obtained the right to redeem "his brethren," so we have redemption through that blood, or relation, if we are in him by faith, *viz.:* such faith as causes us to be holy and without blame bofore God in love, and so become *accepted* in the beloved; then shall we also attain unto the adoption of children by Jesus, our elder brother, and the communication of the same Holy Spirit of God which raised up Jesus from the dead—"Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you:" 2. Corth. 4: 14; then, by that act, our sins are blotted out publicly, forever, and so forgiven as to be remembered no more; and all this "according to the riches of God's grace"—or favor in Jesus Christ, as manifested by the gospel.

Verses 8 and 9.—"Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself."

"Wherein [in the riches of his grace, by the gospel proclaimed] he hath abounded towards us in all wisdom," &c.; and has made known the mystery [secret] of his will, [*viz.:* the adoption of children, by change to incorruptibility; now manifested by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; whereby life and immortality are brought to light; which thing was] according to the good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself;" though till now a mystery, or secret.

Verse 10.—"That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him."

This gathering together in one was another part of "his will" and "good pleasure," which had heretofore been a mystery or secret; but now that purpose is declared; that without distinction of nation, all, who are found with the character described verse 4, "holy," &c., wherever they may be, shall be adopted as children, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times:" a period yet future; and certainly not to open till "the heavens" shall no longer "retain" him who is to come again at the commencement of the "times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken," &c. Acts 3: 21. For this gathering is to be "*in* Christ."

Verse 11.—"In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

"We have obtained an inheritance;" not yet in actual possession; but it is "*in* Christ," and an object of faith; which faith is the substance of things hoped for—the evidence of things not seen—but it counts the inheritance its own, because of the certainty of God's promise, "who calleth those things that be not as though they were;" Rom. 4: 17. This inheritance, Peter informs us, is "incorruptible," and "ready to be revealed in the

ast time;" which he defines to be "at the appearing of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1: 4–7. Thus we see the actual possession of the inheritance is at the same time of the "adoption of children," and can only be had in an incorruptible state. We, who are holy and without blame before him in love, "being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." "*Predestinated*,"—What is predestinated, or determined? That the *inheritance* should be obtained IN Christ—or *in* HIS RIGHT, and through him; *that* is the counsel of God's own will—the inheritance can be had in no other way.

VERSE 12.—"That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ."

"Who first trusted [*hoped*] in Christ;" so the margin reads. "We" apostles, and converts from among the *Jews*, "*first* hoped in Christ." For what did they hope? "The adoption of children," and possession of the inheritance.

VERSE 13.—"In whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise."

In whom ye [Gentiles] hoped [viz. for the adoption] after that they heard the word of truth; the good news of their salvation, or God's design that the Gentiles should share in the same adoption and inheritance. After they believed these glad tidings they were sealed with that Holy Spirit which God promised "to them that obey him." Acts 5: 32; and which commenced being given to Gentile believers at the house of Cornelius, Acts 10: 44, 45; and see also Peter's defence, Acts 11: 15—17.

VERSE 14.—"Which is the earnest of your inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."

This seal of the Spirit is the earnest—the pledge—which God gives beforehand to confirm the believer in the certainty of his possessing the inheritance in the dispensation of the fulness of times. This earnest is to continue "until the redemption of the purchased possession," &c. This purchased possession is the "*flock*" of Christ, "which he has purchased with his own blood;" Acts 20: 28; and the redemption of it is by the adoption; then they receive not merely an earnest but that fulness of the Spirit by which "mortality is swallowed up of life." Glorious prospect—glorious hope. "Worthy of praise is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who had blessed us with all Spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ Jesus." Verse 4.

VERSES 15—17.—"Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers: That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him."

"The spirit of wisdom and revelation," &c.; or, as Paul expresses it, Col. 1: 9, "Wisdom and *spiritual* understanding." See again notes on verse 3. This spiritual understanding men will not and cannot have who quench or resist the Holy Spirit of God; "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." 1 Cor. 2: 11, 12. "But the natural man"—the man who resists the Spirit of God and quenches it, and thereby sinks under his animal nature, or rises no higher than a mere intellectual development—"receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" and he having refused to submit himself to the Spirit of God has not the spiritual developement so far as to attain to "spiritual understanding." This is a special gift of the favor of God in Jesus Christ to those that receive him who is the Sun of righteousness. We might as soon expect to arrive at a knowledge of the earth without the light of the Sun and other planets, as for a man rejecting the light of the Spirit of God, bestowed, through Jesus Christ, to arrive at the knowledge of spiritual things, or all those spiritual blessings which God has stored up in His Son for the enlightenment—salvation—immortality and eternal life of such as truly—humbly—and devoutly submit themselves to him and his method of bestowing those blessings. Nor, are we to suppose that the developement of this spiritual understanding is matured in one day, any more than the physical, or intellectual. Here Paul prayed that God would increase it, even in those who had already received the earnest of the inheritance.

VERSE 18.—"The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints."

"The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, or *opened;* that ye may know what is *the hope of his calling*." His calling is to be "holy," &c., verse 4; and "*the hope*" of that calling is the "*adoption of children*," or incorruptibility, verse 5; the "*redemption*," verse 7; the possession of the "*inheritance*," verse 14. That these glorious promised blessings may have an abiding influence on the mind they must be clearly seen; and that can only be done by the spiritual discernment which is of divine operation; therefore, is a subject of earnest prayer by the apostle in behalf of those who had believed "the word of truth," &c.

A further object for which the apostle wished this opening of their spiritual understanding was, that they might know what is "the *riches* of the glory of his inheritance in the saints." Who can have any clear conceptions on this point except such as are enlightened as Paul prayed the Ephesians might be? Men talk of the riches of this world, and are dazzled with abundance of gold; but God looks for the riches of the glory of *His* inheritance in his saints. What then must be the riches of that glory to which he designs to raise them by their adoption of children? But this is not discoverable by the greatest intellectual developement; if seen at all, it must be by that sight which is of divine operation, viz., a spiritual developement. If any ask, like Nicodemus, "How can these things be?" we can only say, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen;" and "so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Let us see in these remarks the importance of the apostle's prayer.

VERSES 19, 20.—"And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according

to the working of his mighty power; which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places."

Another object of this spiritual enlightenment, in the apostle's mind, as he expresses it, is, that they "might know the *greatness of God's power* to us-ward," by which he is enabled to change mortal, corruptible, dying creatures, who are believers, into immortal, incorruptible creatures, endowed with the power of an endless life, "according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead," &c., and thus made him his first adopted Son, and the pledge and assurance of the adoption of children to all those who are *in* Christ, or are of "his body," *living* members now by faith, manifested by being holy and without blame before God in love. Paul desired they might have such spiritual eye-sight that these things might not be matters of mere intellectual speculation, but matters of knowledge—"that ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of God's power to us-ward." Blessed knowledge—happy experience—but not obtained while men grovel in merely physical or intellectual persuits and entertainments.

We here repeat what we have before said, that, by natural generation, man possesses no principle of immortality or incorruptibility—he is simply an *intellectual animal* of the highest order; and in order to attain to the divine nature, which is spiritual and incorruptible, he "must be born again," or have another birth, viz., of the Spirit. There are *two heads* of God's work relating to man. "The first man Adam was made a *living* soul," or being: but not a *spiritual* being—all he could produce was men like himself—living beings, or intellectual animals. The last Adam (Christ—the second head) was made "a quickening spirit"—it was for him to bring out in man—by a birth of the Spirit—a new—a spiritual nature—"a new creature." The *first* man is of the earth, earthy"—not spiritual, nor immortal; but corruptible in all his tendencies; hence, the necessity of medicine—"the tree of life"—to keep him in existence. "The *second* man is the Lord from heaven"—is a quickening spirit; being possessed of a spiritual nature, and having the Spirit of God upon him without measure. By him alone is a spiritual nature imparted to any soul of man; for, "as is the earthy [the *first* Adam] such are they also that are earthy," [or born of him,] "and as is the heavenly [the *second* Adam] such are they also that are heavenly," [or, are born of him—of heavenly birth.]

The second Adam [Christ] because he was "the *man* Christ Jesus"—died; but being possessed of that spiritual nature which constituted him the head of the spiritual creation, God raised him up from the dead, and seated him at his own right hand—made him the first born from the dead, as the pledge of the "adoption of children to himself," to all who are of "his body," or partakers of the divine nature; without which nature there is NO IMMORTALITY—NO INCORRUPTIBILITY—NO ENDLESS LIFE.

THE FUTURE AGE.—A brother editor, whom we esteem, has lately affirmed that,

"Paul has said that Christ will *destroy with everlasting destruction at his coming* ALL who *know not* God, and obey not the gospel. Hence, if there is to be probation after the advent, it must be after the destruction of ALL the wicked."

The caps and italics are just as we find them. The author will not allow any "*inferences*" to be used against his view, but is bold in "*inferences*" on his own side of the question. Will the reader examine the whole text, as it stands in Paul's language. 2 Thess. 1: 6—10, and see where the emphatic word "ALL" is to be found, connected with "the wicked."

It will be seen, that our brother has "*inferred*," first,—that "ALL the wicked" are to be destroyed "*at* Christ's coming;" which the text does not affirm; and if it did, it would only prove that there is no "*second* resurrection," if they are *then* destroyed "*with everlasting destruction;*" which doctrine, perhaps, he believes.

But, second. The text speaks not of "ALL the wicked;" it is a specified class of them, viz. *First.* They have "*troubled*" the saints; therefore lived among them. *Second.* They have *heard* "the gospel." *Third.* They had "not obeyed the gospel." *Fourth.* As a consequence, they "know not God." Does this include "ALL the wicked?" not excepting those "who had not heard his fame nor seen his glory?" Isa. 66: 18 and 19. Are those included who are "left of all the nations," *after* "the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with thee?" Zech. 14: 5, 16.

Perhaps our brother will say, the expression—"that know not God," includes all the wicked. But, it is easy to see, that Paul speaks of a specific class of wicked; not barely "them that know not God," but, "AND obey not the gospel," &c. Do not separate "what God has joined together." The wicked who have had the gospel clearly proclaimed to them, and still remain ignorant of God, *and* obey not the gospel, we believe will have no further means of salvation after the advent. As to others, that is entirely another matter; but, we shall not discuss it now. Even in regard to those who have disobeyed the gospel, Paul does not say, they will have their punishment "*at* Christ's coming;" but he does affirm what their punishment is to be, viz., "*everlasting destruction.*" But if it is to be "*at* his coming," "*at*" must be used with great latitude; for, it is manifest, they will be judged *before* they are punished. And here we may add, that, the phrase "*in that day*" will not help the matter, if anything in judgment is to take place analogous to the process of judging among men; for, it would require at least six thousand years to speak all the names of the human family, if we allow sixty to be spoken every minute, without interruption. The advocates of a literal day judgment, or a year-day judgment, will find a difficulty in their theory which will call for a few "*inferences*" to help them out.

DIED in Penn Yan, N. Y., Dec. 23d, of consumption, in a full and glorious hope of the *better resurrection*, the wife of Br. Silas Hawley, Jr. RANDOLPH E. LADD.

THE SIX SERMONS on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had of the Author, 18 Chester street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or ten copies $1. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" and the tract of twelve pages, on the Rich man and Lazarus; 120 pages in all. The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*," or cause them to cease from life, after the judgment. Cash in all cases with the order.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1849. No. 3.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

"DID IT RAIN BEFORE THE FLOOD?"

A writer in the "Advent Harbinger," Mr. E. R. PINNEY, takes exception to an observation, made by us in the January number of the Bible Examiner, in relation to the above question. And, though the settlement of this question is unimportant, for the sake of arriving at the *truth* on the subject, we will notice briefly the remarks of Mr. Pinney.

1. This gentleman says—"Now I take the ground that there is proof, and Bible proof, that it rained before the flood." But Mr. Pinney's proof amounts to no proof in fact. He presents some arguments which may be turned against him, with considerable force. We allude to his reference to the rainbow, as a token of God's covenant, that he would not *again* destroy the world by a flood. Upon this point Mr. Pinney says—"The rainbow which, says God, '*I* DO *set in the cloud*,' not will, but '*do set*'—a customary thing—with which Noah was well acquainted," &c.

Now, we presume Mr. Pinney knows, that if it had rained before the flood, the rainbow, according to principles "governing the natural world," must have been perfectly familiar to Noah; and God, in speaking of it, would not have said—"*I do set*," but *I have set* my bow in the clouds. But he says "*I* DO *set*," now, in the present tense; not in the past, nor future, but NOW. The rainbow was not "a customary" thing. It was something new—something upon which Noah had never looked before. God does not select "customary" things as tokens, or signs of his covenants. He *institutes* something new and striking, and ordains that as the sign of his covenant, as in the case of circumcision. What could have been a more striking sign of God's covenant, when the revolving clouds were rolling through the heavens, than to display the rainbow in all its beauty and sublimity, "with a wing on the earth, and a wing on the sea."

2. Moses affirms that the garden was *watered* by a *river*; and this being the case with Egypt, the Nile, to our mind, afforded an appropriate illustration.

3. Moses gives the following testimony in the second chapter of Genesis, fifth verse—"And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: *for* the Lord God had not caused it to rain on the earth; but," instead of the rain, "*there went up a mist from the earth*, and watered the whole face of the ground."

If Mr. Pinney has not seen a practical illustration of this at the North, we assure him that we have seen many in the sunny South. The grammatical construction of the sentence shows, that the "mist" which "went up from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground," was a substitute for the rain which "the Lord God had not caused" to fall.

4. Mr. Pinney might have shortened his article, if he had remembered that "rain" is not so much the offspring of the "earth," as it is of the rivers, lakes, seas and oceans, from which it ascends in the form of "mists," if he pleases, and then becomes condensed in the form of clouds; and, at a given temperature, descends in the form of "rain." But the "mist" Moses speaks of, "went up from the *earth*," and he says not a word about clouds nor rain.

5. One word more, as it respects God's covenant with Noah. If the rainbow was "a customary" subject of contemplation with the ante-diluvians, then how plausibly they might have argued—Does God say this bow is a sign that he will never again destroy the earth with a flood: why, we have seen this bow a thousand times before, and yet He *has* destroyed the earth—what assurance, then, have we that what he has done, when the bow was there, he will not do again? But, if they had never seen it before, they would regard it with the most profound awe, and look upon it as a *new* and *fresh* token of the truth of God's promise!

J. T. WALSH.

THE AGES—NO. II.

END OF JEWISH WORLD.

In our first article on this subject, we promised to make a very important application of our view of the flood. We now proceed to that application.

1. It is evident that the apostle Peter makes use of the flood as an illustration of the destruction of the Jewish polity, which is the subject of discussion in the 3d chapter of 2 Peter. He commences that chapter thus:—"This second epistle, beloved, I now write to you: in which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance, that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets." We shall see hereafter that the destruction of the Jewish state, was predicted by the "prophets." "And of the commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord; knowing this first, that there will come in the last days" (of the Jewish age) "scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers" (of Israel, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) "fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that, according to the word of God, the heavens were of old, and the earth *consisting* out of the water and in the water, by which the world ("of the ungodly") that then was, being overflowed with water perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now, according to the same word

are kept in store, reserved to fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."

2. Our object has been to show, that the flood, which is the illustration of Peter, was limited to an extent of territory, called "the world of the ungodly." And that "the heavens and the earth," spoken of by this Apostle, are to be understood in the same limited sense, and not as applicable to the whole globe. And, in further proof of this point, we will analyze the quotation already made.

3. Peter is writing "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us" (the Apostles) "through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" and he says to these persons "knowing this first that there will come in the last days *scoffers*, walking after their own lusts." Peter writes to these saints as if the fact just stated, was a matter of knowledge to them. These "scoffers" did appear before the destruction of Jerusalem, and mocked at the idea of the speedy destruction of their City and Temple, the burning of their villages, and the desolation of the land. This calamity was the subject of prophecy by their own Prophets, of John the Baptist, by Jesus Christ, and by the Apostles. These things were continually sounded in their ears, but, because of God's "long-suffering," and consequent apparent "delay," they scoffed at the idea, and taunted those who announced it.

Peter brings to their "remembrance," that "the heavens and the earth," the Jewish heavens and earth, in contradistinction to the antediluvian, or patriarchal heavens and earth, which were swept away by the flood, "according to the same word, are kept in store, reserved to fire against the day of judgment," upon Israel, "and perdition," or destruction, "of ungodly men" who "received not" the Messiah.

Peter then continues: "But, beloved," though these "scoffers are willingly ignorant," "be" ye "not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." And that, therefore, "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise" to come, "as some men count slackness, (or delay;) but is *long-suffering* TOWARDS US," the Jews, "not willing that any" of the nation "should perish, but that all should come to repentance." The phrase "long-suffering toward us," in the above sentence, fixes its application to the Jews; and thus limits the *subject* to them and their land, politically and ecclesiastically.

"But," says Peter, notwithstanding His "long-suffering" and "delay,"—"the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in which" (day) "the heavens will pass away with a great noise, and the elements will melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein will be burned up. Seeing then that all these things will be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy deportment and godliness, looking for and hasting to the coming of the day of God, in which the heavens being on fire will be dissolved, and the elements will melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless" —notwithstanding "all these things will be dissolved,"—"we, according to his promise," in the prophetic word, "look for new heavens and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteonsness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things," as the new heavens and earth, "be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless."

Thus we have given a paraphrase of this long quotation; and, perhaps, the reader may involuntarily exclaim, this language is too strong to apply to the dissolution of the Jewish political and ecclesiastical heaven and earth! To all such, however, we must, with the apostle Peter, present the exhortation to "be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets." To them we shall appeal in illustration and confirmation of our position. But, before proceeding to the prophets, permit us to enquire, what heavens, in the popular acceptation, and according to the orthodox view, are to be set on fire? and what elements are to melt with fervent heat? The "firmament" is called heaven in Genesis: Is this the heaven? Is it the etherial or atmospheric expanse, that is to be set on fire? Is it the atmospheric compound, called "elements," which is to melt? Or is it the whole solar system, which is to be destroyed? Will some world-burner tell us? And may we be permitted to ask, what have the sun moon and stars to do with the moral destiny of the earth?

4. But to the prophets. The reader will see before we get through, that our views of the flood, as also the language of Peter, is fully sustained.

Turn now to the xxiv. chapter of Isaiah, and read a prediction concerning the land of Israel: "Behold, the Lord maketh the *earth empty*, and maketh it *waste*, and *turneth it upside down*, and scattereth abroad its inhabitants." Again, He says, "The *land* shall be *utterly emptied*, and *utterly spoiled*; for the Lord hath spoken this word."

What is termed "the earth" in the first verse, is, in the third verse called "the land." Let the reader remember this.

"The earth, (4th v.) mourneth and fadeth away, the world languisheth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languish: Here the sentence "the *world* languisheth," is explained by "the haughty *people* of the earth do languish."

"The earth (5th v.) also is defiled under its inhabitants; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the *curse* DEVOURED (eaten up) THE EARTH, and they that dwell in it are desolate: *therefore the* INHABITANTS OF THE EARTH ARE BURNED, *and few men left.*"

Thus we have a "devoured earth," and its "inhabitants burned." Compare that with Peter.

The prophet then hints at the restoration of Israel, and passes on to the destruction of their enemies. "*The earth is entirely broken down, the earth is* ENTIRELY DISSOLVED, *the earth is exceedingly moved.* The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard; and shall be removed like a cottage; and the transgression of it shall be heavy upon it; *and* IT SHALL FALL AND NOT RISE AGAIN." The langunge here, in reference to "the great day of battle of God Almighty," is much stronger, if any thing, than the language of Peter. And yet it bears internal evidence of being figurative. The earth is first spoken of as being "utterly broken down;" then as "entirely dissolved," and finally, as "exceedingly moved." Now, if it were literally "dissolved" it could not be subsequently "moved." And furthermore, after being "dissolved," it is represented as "reeling to and fro," and as "falling and not rising again." The whole, therefore, is but a highly wrought description of the "dissolution" of the political "earth" and ecclesiastical "heavens," which shall be contemporaneous with the Lord's coming. Hence the prophet adds, "and it shall come to pass in that

day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth." It is needless to add that *this* could not be done, if the previous description is understood literally.

"And they shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in prison, and after many days shall they be visited. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed when the Lord of hosts shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." Of course, then, the earth is not really to be "dissolved," because, if so, Mount Zion and Jerusalem would be "dissolved" with it, and the Lord could not reign there.

You will now read the 4th chapter of Jeremiah, in which we have another prediction concerning the desolations of Zion. We quote from the 20th verse: "Destruction upon destruction is cried; for the whole land is laid waste; suddenly are my tents ruined, and my curtains in a moment. How long shall I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet? For my people are foolish, they have not known me; they are sottish children, and they have no understanding: they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge."

"*I beheld the earth, and lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light.* I beheld the mountains, and lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and lo, there was no man, and all the fowls of the heavens had fled. I beheld, and lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all its cities were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger. For thus saith the Lord, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end. For this shall the earth mourn, and the heavens above be black: because I have spoken it, I have purposed it, and will not repent, neither will I turn back from it."

The attentive reader must see in this quotation, as strong language as that used by Peter, or that used by our Lord in the 24th chapter of Matthew. And if we take heed to "the words of the Prophets," concerning the desolations of Zion, we must be convinced that Peter was describing nothing more than the passing away of the Jewish heavens and earth; the same heavens and earth of which Jeremiah speaks, when he says: "I beheld the *earth*, and lo, *it was without form, and void;* and the *heavens*, and *they had no light.*"

Again, Peter speaks of the elementsmelting with fervent heat; and in Jeremiah, 7th chapter, 20th verse, we read: "Therefore, thus, saith the Lord God; behold, my anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; *and* IT SHALL BURN, *and shall not be quenched.*"

Again, in the 9th chapter the Prophet says: "For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing, and for the habitations of the wilderness a lamentation, *because* THEY ARE BURNED UP, *so that none can pass through them;*" &c. In the 17th chapter, 27th verse, we find the following: "But if ye will not hearken to me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; *then will* I KINDLE A FIRE IN ITS GATES, AND IT SHALL DEVOUR THE PALACES OF JERUSALEM, AND IT SHALL NOT BE QUENCHED."

In the 21st chapter, the Prophet, speaking of Israel's land, says—"*I will kindle a fire in the forest thereof, and it shall devour all things around it.*"

In the 2d chapter of Joel we have an extended description of the destruction of Jerusalem; but it is too lengthy for an entire insertion: we will only refer to some parts of it, and request the reader to peruse the whole.

The Prophet Joel, speaking of the mighty army which shall come against Jerusalem, says: "*A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth:* the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; and nothing shall escape them." Again, at the 10th verse, he says: "The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining."

We conceive that we have presented sufficient testimony to sustain our position; but we will refer to a few passages for the purpose of *illustrating* the subject.

In the first chapter of Nahum, 5th verse, where the prophet is predicting the destruction of Nineveh, he says—"The mountains quake at him, (the Lord,) *and the hills melt, and the earth is burned* at his presence, *even the world, and all that dwell therein.*"

This language is equally strong with that of Peter, and yet it is undeniably applicable to the destruction of Nineveh. The "hills" are represented as "melting," and "the world" as being "burned up."

In Zephaniah, 1st chapter, God says, "*I will utterly consume all things from off the earth.*" Again, He says, "but the whole land shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy."

As a final quotation, on this subject, in this article, we refer to Malachi, 4th chapter: "For behold, the day cometh, that shall *burn as an oven;* and all the proud and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall *burn them up,* saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

Now, we appeal to the reader, whether or not we have sustained our exposition of Peter. And if any should have objections to our view of this subject, if they will *briefly* state them, we shall be pleased to remove them; for we feel confident, that there are many proofs, yet untouched, of the truth of our position. In our next, we shall continue the subject in connexion with the 24th of Matthew, and other collateral passages. J. T. W.

FUTURE STATES.

By REV. REGINALD COURTENAY, A. M.

(Continued from page 24.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

In considering the language of Scripture concerning death and the grave, life and resurrection, we naturally turn to the Old Testament in the first instance. We should reasonably expect that volume to contain less hopeful views of the grave than are presented in the New; inasmuch as in the latter, "life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel" of Christ. Yet we have not reason to suppose that the first Advent effected any such immediate *change* in Hades itself as to render the language of the Jewish Scriptures inapplicable to the now existing state of things. If the dead were unconscious till the resurrection or ascension of Christ, so do they still remain. The one volume exhibits

chiefly the prison and bondage of the grave, the other Christ the Redeemer;—Christ, not altering the nature of the grave, not at once subduing death, but emancipating first himself from its dominion; and afterwards at his second advent, about to emancipate his saints: not at once *giving* them victory, but securing for them, and making more fully known to them, the certainty of their future triumph.

Turning afterwards to the *New* Testament, we shall have to consider whether it does not confirm the impression produced by the Old,—that the grave is to the soul of man a place or state of utter darkness and desolation, of profound sleep, of utter insensibility,—without hope, or retrospect, sorrow, or joy: whether it does not leave Hades still in gloom, and reserve all its rays of glory for "the brightness of the coming" of Christ and the resurrection of the dead.

To commence with the account of man's creation in Genesis. God made man in his own image, after his likeness: but he formed him moreover of the dust of the ground; and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, made him a living soul. Now is man immortal, because he was "in the image of God?" or because "he became a living soul?" Each conclusion has been maintained; but some supporters of the one have not ventured to maintain the other. The inferior animals, as has been already shown, partook of the same breath of life as man. *The same*, for in Genesis no difference is made, and further on the sameness is expressly asserted. "When God gathers unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Though the breath of God caused Adam to become a living soul, it did not therefore give him an immortal soul; for the effect cannot survive its sustaining cause; and the "*breath* of life" being withdrawn, the life itself must cease. It is the *second* Adam that is immortal, not the first; the "quickening spirit," not the "living soul." But this is to anticipate.

And why should a creature, formed in the image of God, be immortal? This reason sounds strangely from the lips of such as assert that man has *wholly lost* that image. If, as is urged by Calvin and others, the image of the Father of Spirits could be represented, to our mental vision, in no other way than through the "spiritual part" of man, still it may be asked,—why an *eternal* part? Granting even that it was wholly "in righteousness and true holiness" that man was formed "after the image of him that created him," why should man therefore endure forever, inasmuch as that holiness is a possession capable of forfeiture? Created *in* time, man might endure *for* a time, and yet be truly a representative, in many of his attributes, of the Eternal, and Unchanging God. For why should a future eternity be held more essential to the resemblance than a past eternity? To the Being of God Himself the one condition is as essential as the other; and still more,—why should Adam be thought to resemble God in the attribute of future eternity, when in that of holiness no longer?

Some persons have held that the solemn deliberation of the Almighty, before the creation of Adam, and the minuteness of detail with which that creation is described, indicate an essential difference between man and the rest of the animated creatures. Be it so. But while these things lead us to believe that the indwelling Spirit of God made Adam "like the most High," let them teach also the solemn lesson, that the glorious privilege could be forfeited, and the man "brought down to Hades:" that He who made Adam a creature *of* dust, could unmake him into dust again, and "cut him down to the ground;" that without the supernatural sustenance of the Tree of Life, his living soul and body, even as those of the other earth-born creatures, were but perishable things.

It might fairly be urged on the other hand, that other parts of Scripture prove the Mosaic account to be short of the real truth. The subtle serpent was Satan. The Garden of Eden is universally held to have been a place of more than earthly delights, the Tree of Life, we know, can grow in the soil of heaven. The creation therefore of Adam from the dust, and his condemnation to return to dust, ought not to be too narrowly and unspiritually taken. But what should be our more spiritual interpretation but this, that Adam was created mortal, and fell by natural relapse? That the first man was of the earth, earthy?

Moreover, death was the punishment of Adam's transgression. "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife," toil and pain shall be thy portion, "till thou return to the ground, for dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." If the separation of soul and body be not IN ITSELF a punishment, then was death no punishment to Adam. In what consists, according to the opposite notion, the proper "sting of *Death*;" and what is "the power of *the grave*?" They are plainly reduced to nothing. Punishments may indeed be inflicted for transgression upon a disembodied soul (as upon a soul incorporate,) but this does not render death itself a punishment, nor give any reason why the grave should be dreaded by man, why the soul should abhor to be left in Hades, and seek to be redeemed from its tyranny.

It has been urged that the separation of soul and body cannot be the thing intended; because Adam did not, in that sense, die *in the day* when he transgressed. The sentence is held to involve death, spiritual, temporal, and eternal; and Adam is supposed to have undergone the first kind of death immediately, and the second afterwards. But it is not easy to show how *any* part of the sentence could be delayed, without violation of the letter of the law. Let us however remember, that on the very day on which Adam fell, and before the sentence of his death had gone forth from the mouth of his Judge, a promise of mercy through Christ was set before the trembling sinner. The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world arrested the execution; purchased present forbearance, and opened a new and living way, whereby the decree might be virtually annulled. And if Adam died "in faith," then, in the sense of the decree, he surely died not at all; he died a stingless death, a death which was, *to him*, at once swallowed up in final victory. But this may be rendered more plain hereafter, by the light of the New Testament.

The total privation of life is indeed a grievous calamity to a happy creature, and even they whose existence is far from being happy shrink from the idea of death: but if the privation be temporary, and be followed by a restoration to life and happiness, then death itself may seem desirable, *not* for

its own sake, but for the sake of its consequences; or the interval may be altogether disregarded in comparison of the glories which are expected to follow. And thus we find the inspired writers of the Old Testament speak of the grave sometimes as a place of gloom and desolation (such as to be itself a punishment to the wicked,) and from which the righteous shrink back, while at the same time they earnestly contemplate a *future* deliverance from its inevitable grasp; and sometimes regarding it as a welcome resting-place for the soul until the end of the world; and sometimes overlooking it altogether, through the brightness of the vision beyond. NEVER is the grave said to be in itself desirable, to be a place of life, and light, and joy; NEVER is death represented to be a gladsome or even a hopeful state. In the most favorable view of it, it is called a sleep,—a welcome word for the righteous, since it reminds them of their joyful awakening; but not expressive of conscious peace, as some pretend, since the same "sleep" is inflicted on sinners as their punishment. Very commonly it is described by negatives, as a state wherein is no thought, no hope, no knowledge, no light; but wherein man is as a thing that is utterly perished and gone.

Thus David declares that man, when in the grave, has "no longer any remembrnace of God," that he cannot "give him thanks," nor "declare his truth; that "the dead cannot praise the Lord, nor any that go down into silence;" that the *faithfulness and truth* of God are not manifested to man, so long as he lies in the grave, nor his *righteousness* shown in the land of forgetfulness;" that "when man's breath goeth forth he returneth to the earth, and in that very day his thoughts *perish*." Solomon uses language even stronger than this, if possible, to show the utter unconsciousness of the grave. "A living dog," he says "is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not *any thing*."* And further, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is *no* work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." Tillotson's comment upon this is a follows. "This life is the proper season of activity and industry, of designing and doing those things which tend to our future happiness; and when this life is ended there will be no further opportunity of working; nothing will remain but to receive the recompense;" etc. But they who work well, "shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." And the Preacher's words are a warning to work, "before the night cometh."

Dr. Watts, in the same spirit of equivocation with Tillotson, chooses to suppose that David and Solomon speak only of "such thoughts and actions, both religious and civil, as are practised in this life,"—"men's present way and manner of divine worship; and their management or consciousness of human affairs;" but not to exclude "all manner of consciousness, knowledge, thought, and action, such as may be united to the invisible state of spirits." But surely this is a most idle and weak pretence. If the state of those who have died in the love and fear of God be one of vivid consciousness, how can it be said that "all thoughts perish?" What manner of knowledge and consciousness is consistent with the assertion,—"the living know that they shall die, but the dead *know not any thing*?" How can it possibly be said of beatified spirits who are rejoicing in the presence of Jehovah, worshiping Him for His greatness, glorifying Him for their redemption, that "they cannot give God thanks, nor declare His truth, nor perceive his faithfulness?" How could the grave possibly be to them a "land of forgetfulness?" How could it be said, that God's loving-kindness is there unknown? And how,—to proceed with our evidence from the Old Testament,—how could Job term the grave "a land of darkness, and of the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness?" Further on, being weary of his life, because of the afflictions wherewith he was visited, he exclaims, "Are not my days few? cease then [O my God] and let me take comfort a little, before I go hence and be no more seen." So far was he from looking to the grave iself, as a place wherein he should be comforted after his sorrows.

David, Solomon, and Job, were not ignorant that a life awaited them beyond the grave: nor did they, through any *doubts* about this matter, throw a false gloom on the valley of the shadow of death. Had they been ignorant, they would have been silent; the Holy Spirit would not have lent His sanction to their errors; and allowed the words of inspiration to be mingled and contaminated with positive falsehood. For if the soul of man, when in Hades, is in joy and felicity beyond that of earth, *it is* wholly false to represent the grave as a land of forgetfulness, and where God's truth is not manifested, nor His righteousness known.* Though Solomon knew that God would "bring every work into judgment," and David foresaw the resurrection of Christ, and trusted that he would be "shewn the path of life;" and Job expected "in his flesh to see God," none of them, we have seen, expected to enjoy God's presence *before* they were raised from the dead.

The use of the word "sleep" for death, by these and other inspired writers, would alone go far to prove that it is a state of darkness, silence, forgetfulness, unconsciousness. Thus it is written of the profligate and idolatrous people of Babylon, "In their heat I will make their feasts, and make them drunken that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord." And of the resurrection at the Last Day, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, and shall come forth, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The same word is frequently used in the New Testament, and in the same sense, in passages which will be considered hereafter. The strongest passage in all the bible, however, is perhaps that in the

* See Eccles. ix. 4. Calvin could find no better mode of evading the force of this, than by supposing that by "the dead" were meant such as were so buried in trespasses and sins, as to be unmindful of death, and of all things of spiritual importance; while by "the living" was intended such as were duly mindful of death, and were alive to their best interests! It would seem then, that a living dog is one that knows he shall die, a dead lion one that does not!

* The question concerns not dead corpses, but dead men. It would be preposterous to say that *the body*, when in the grave, is ignorant of God's truth and righteousness: which *never were* known at all, except by the soul.

fourteenth chapter of the book of Job. "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease, though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground, yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant. But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time and remember me. If a man die shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait until my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire unto the work of thine hands." Here it is asserted, that when man expires he is completely gone, and does as entirely disappear, as the flood which, after the rainy season, is dried up by the sun and wind. That in him there is no stock that may sprout again, no surviving principle of life, which, under more favorable circumstances, may again exhibit its dormant energies. He shall indeed be remembered by the Almighty, he shall then awake and answer the call of God, but till then he is asleep and kept secret, "hidden in the grave," bearing no part and discharging no functions among *living* beings. Few indeed, if any, of those persons who believe in an intermediate consciousnes could bring themselves to utter this ejaculation of Job. What meaning could *they* attach to the prayer, "O that thou wouldest *hide* me in the grave, and keep me secret till the judgment day," who expect a still nearer approach to God, than when they abode in the flesh, and, in many instances, even look for an immediate introduction to the "the innumerable company of angels," and to the "spirits of just men made perfect?"

This passage of Job receives valuable illustration from Isaiah. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that *dwell in dust*, for your dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself, as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." Here, having first proclaimed a joyful resurrection for God's people, the prophet calls upon them, in the name of the Lord, to enter without fear the chambers of the grave; and there abide until the indignation be overpast, i. e. according to Job, "till the heavens be no more." Till then they were to be "hidden in the grave," and kept secret." But shall the interval seem long and dreary? Far from it. "Hide thyself, my people, AS IT WERE FOR A LITTLE MOMENT."

Let us now consider the language used in a time of trial by one of the most faithful of God's servants of old, Hezekiah king of Judah. He lived in intimacy with Isaiah, and was visited by the prophet on what he deemed to be his deathbed. After his recovery he wrote, "I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in *the land of the living*, I shall behold man no more, with the inhabitants of the world." "For the grave cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot *hope for thy truth*." No pretence similar to that of Dr. Watts can be here maintained for a moment. To "hope for the truth of God" is an exercise of thought peculiarly fitted for the state of disembodied spirits, if they be really conscious.

And why should this our present world be termed "*the* land of the living," if life, equally energetic, awaited the disembodied spirit?

Nor can it be said that it is the body only which, goes down into the pit. Hezekiah did not grieve because his *body* could not hope for the truth of God when in the grave; but because *he himself* could not: i. e. because the grave extended its dominion even over those faculties of the mind of which hope is an exercise.

One other passage should be added to these, which will nearly complete our Old Testament evidence. "I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see, that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of a man that goeth upward,* and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" To which we may add the words in the latter part of the same book, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return to the God who gave it." Bishop Bull was so little pleased with the language of the Preacher in the first of these passages, that he chooses to put the greater part of it into the mouth of an unbeliever! Solomon he says, "introduces an Epicurean (if he may be so called by anticipation,) deriding the notion of the soul's immortality." Yet what is said here that differs from the sentence—Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return? What is implied in the return of the dust to its parent earth, and of the spirit to God the Creator, but that each shall be as before the creation of man? Not that this would render death a total annihilation. He who created, and unmade again, can as easily renew his work; and can restore the soul of man, when he raises his body from the grave, by breathing again into his nostrils the breath of life.

But *until* God shall thus manifest His power and glory, and fulfil His promises, for the happiness of his creatures, man, say the Scriptures of the Old Testament, is not in a region of glory, but in a land of darkness; not in the presence of God; but hidden in secret chambers; not employed in glorifying him, but buried in sleep; "*not hoping for His truth*," but "in a land where all things are forgotten." Whoever disbelieves this, must hold that by "the dead" is meant only the "dead corpses," that the grave is called a "land of forgetfulness," because these corpses cannot exert the (mental) power of memory; and finally, that by "those who cannot hope for God's truth, nor know his loving-kindness," are intended—the carcases of saints in glory!

* Or according to the Septuagint, "Who knoweth if the spirit of man goeth upward," etc. And this seems to be a fair translation of the Hebrew.

Suppositions these so utterly preposterous that it is impossible that men could ever have believed in the consciousness and glorification of the dead, had they not utterly disregarded the import of the language of the Old Testament; and rested either on the suggestions of their own minds, the *authority* of a prevalent opinion, or, at best, on some (misinterpreted) passages occurring in one portion only of the inspired books. But whatever the New Testament may appear to some persons to declare, its language must, if possible, be reconciled with that of the Old; and unless the former should expressly and unequivocally declare that the dead are alive, and the sleeping saints fully awake, we may safely rest satisfied with the faith of David and Solomon, of Isaiah, Daniel, and Job; and with their blessed hope that, though for a little moment they should sleep in the dust of the earth, they should yet "awake to everlasting life, and shine as the brightness of the firmament forever."

[To be continued.]

THE DISCUSSION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The following letter has just been received from Dr. LEES, the Editor of *The Truth Seeker and Christian Thinker*, which may be interesting to the readers of *the Bible Examiner*, as well as to ourselves:

"LEEDS, England, January 12, 1849.

I.

MY DEAR MR. STORRS:—The discussion of *your* question proceeds apace, and attracts more and more attention both from the 'orthodox-pretenders,' and the freethinking Christians at large.

I informed you in my last, of the *new* argument of 'Immortality by Nature,' put forth by JOHN HOWARD HINTON, M. A., in his tract 'Who will live forever?' That tract has called forth two rejoinders—one from E. WHITE, of Hereford, the other from W. MORRIS, of Plymouth.* I subjoin the titles; also the title of another work on the subject, that I had not before heard of, to which Mr. Hinton has replied.

There has just appeared a volume of 540 pages, from the pen of Mr. Hinton, entitled '*Athanasia*.'† It is written in a clear style, and logical spirit, evidences much thought and learning, and, what is as refreshing as it is rare with his party, treats those against whose views it is written, with that *decent* respect to which every man is entitled, whatever his opinions. "*The search for Truth*," he says, in *his preface*, "*is open to all; and mankind have no greater benefactors than those who*, with *suffcient wisdom on the one hand, and sufficient courage on the other, endeavor to rectify deeply rooted and prevalent mistakes.*"

This Book consists (1) of 'Four Books on Immortality.' Pages 1 to 64, are devoted to 'the argument as conducted by *a clergyman*;'—pages 65 to 166, to 'the argument as conducted by the Rev. H. H. Dobney;' pages 167 to 336, to 'the argument as conducted by the Rev. Edward White;' and pages 337 to 420, to 'the argument as conducted by the Rev. George Storrs,' etc., wherein 50 pages are devoted to your 'Six Sermons,' and which also contains 'A chapter of Contradictions,' alleged to be composed of the sayings of Messrs. Dobney, White, Storrs, etc. Then follows the original Tract, '*Who will live forever?*' and the volume concludes with 'Rejoinders' to Messrs. White and Morris.

You will perceive that you have in Mr. Hinton an opponent worthy of you, and I trust, will lose no time in procuring his volume, and replying to it. If you vanquish *him*, you vanquish *all*, for he is incomparably the greatest champion of 'Eternal Misery' that has yet appeared. I would suggest, also, that if you reprint Mr. Dobney's Book, you should add as *Notes* in the proper place, Mr. Hinton's remarks, with your own *Reply*. This seems necessary, and would give an original character to the reprint.

I beg also to direct your attention to another work, indirectly bearing on your subject—a new cheap "*Biblical Cyclopædia:* By JOHN EADIE, L. L. D., Professor of Bib. Lit. to the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland. Griffin & Co., London." Under the proper heads—as "Parable,' 'Soul,' Hell," etc., you will find some singular *admissions*, and also some counter arguments against your views, well worthy your attention. The Book is also valuable for other purposes, and I shall feel obliged if you can insert a *Review* of it, and Dr. Lillie's *Reply to Professor Stuart*, which I will shortly send you, as it involves some important principles of criticism, applicable to the purposes of your periodical.

II.

Some of Mr. WALSH's able articles I have glanced at, and, though adopting the same side of the question, I would still suggest the question—Whether he does not somewhat *stretch* the fact of the connection between matter and mind too far? Let me briefly state my views.

(1.) As to the class of facts showing a *correspondence of vigor*, at various periods of life, between the *bodily* and *mental* functions. The changes are *simultaneous to some extent*, but not *universally*. The last are sometimes bright, when there seems a *general* decay in the former. But overpassing this apparent discrepancy, and granting that mental development is in general harmony with structural strength, from the first to the second childhood of men, it does not logically follow *on this account* that the mental change *is dependent* on the organic state. Our bodies afford a clear example of *synchronous progress* without *causative dependence*. All our organs and tissues develope and decay, *in the same periods*, but the legs do not increase in bulk *because* the arms expand, nor the head grow *because* the limbs enlarge.

(2.) As to the class of facts which manifest a modification (or suspension) of the *mental functions*, when the integrity of the *corporeal structure* of the brain has been disturbed (by accident or disease.) Does this relation entitle us to say, that the mind has an *absolute dependence* upon structure, that it cannot exist when the fabric is destroyed? Now dependence here may be of two kinds—the dependence of a thing upon its *own* cause or conditions-

---

* "*Who will live for Ever?* A reply to the Rev. J. H. Hinton's criticism on Luke xx. 36. With an *appendix* on the signification of 'Life' and 'Death.' By EDWARD WHITE." Jackson & Walford, London. 1848.

"*Christ and the Sadducees*: or the meaning of Luke xx. 36, vindicated." By the Rev. W. MORRIS, Plymouth. Houlston & Stoneman, London, 1848.

"*Christ our Life*: or the Scripture Testimony concerning Immortality. By a Clergyman of the Church of England." Dublin, 1835.

† *Athanasia*: by JOHN HOWARD HINTON. London, Houlston & Stoneman. 1849. Price 6s.

without which it cannot exist;—or, that of dependance upon a *foreign* agency *not essential to the existence* of the *thing itself* which is influenced by that agency.

(*a.*) A watch, for example, has its movements *dependent* on the parts of its mechanism as its essential conditions (or cause,) so that if one cog, or wheel, or link, were removed, action would *cease*.

(*b.*) But, would not movement *also cease*, if any part of the watch-work were obstructed by a pin, or other *foreign substance?* Yes; for even now I arrest the spring of my watch *with my tooth-pick*, and behold it ceases to work:—and but again, I *withdraw my hand* to write, and *the ticking is resumed*.

In the case of (*a*) the working would cease from the abstraction of an *essential* element of causation—in the case of (*b*) the movement would stop, not because it was *dependent* on my tooth-pick, but because that foreign force *hindered* the play of the essential one.

The bodily functions furnish ample illustrations of the latter instance: and *may* it not be *analogous* to the relation subsisting between mind and body? between the real *vital force* (which Swedenborg has asserted to be a *spiritual organization*) and the changing material structures which it *forms* into maturity, but which, after a while, it cannot longer protect from the *destructive* outward forces?

May *it* not survive, uninjured amidst 'the war of elements, the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds?' If this be *not* so, it is important that it should be *demonstrated* upon right and rigid principles, and that the Truth should not be injured by a fallacy.

It is clearly *possible* that the exercise of the mental faculties may be affected by injury to some *allied* organ (in the brain,) not because the integrity of the brain was the *cause* of the mental function, but because the exercise of the mind is *hindered* by the foreign action of a *preternatural state* of this allied organ.

Yours very truly, in the bonds of Truth,
FREDERIC RICHARD LEES.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—The stereotype plates for this work are nearly completed, and it will soon be put to press. This fact will prevent our complying with Dr. Lee's suggestion, in his letter, in relation to it.

We have ordered Hinton's work from England, and shall be able to judge of it for ourselves when we have read it. We promise our readers if we are convinced that we are in error they shall have the benefit of our "*confession*," premising, however, that the work must differ in evidence, from anything we have ever yet seen, or it will not begin to convince us of man's natural immortality. But we shall be glad to find so able and candid an opponent as Dr. Lees represents Mr. Hinton to be. The controversy must come in this country; though as yet most orthodox ministers cautiously avoid it. Perhaps Mr. Hinton will help them to arguments so that they will venture out a little. In the mean time, let our friends scatter Dobney's work; which is put at the low price of *fifty cents*, in paper covers, with one third off where six or more copies are taken. Bound, 75 cents, with one third discount to wholesale purchasers. Cash must be sent with the order. Now let us hear from those immediately who wish the work sent them. Its value you can only know by reading; when read, lend it to your neighbors till it is worn out.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"*He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*"—1 *John* 5: 12.

TOUR EAST.—The Editor of the Examiner expects to spend two weeks in Boston, in April; and may visit some other places in that vicinity. He will be glad to see all who may wish to have an interview with him. He intends to have a supply of the Six Sermons there, for those who may wish them; and hopes also, to be able to furnish the work of Dobney at the same time. The definite time of his being in Boston will be noticed in the next Examiner.

Br. BREWSTER'S article, in reply to Br. Walsh, intended for the present number of the Examiner, by some unaccountable circumstance, over which we had no control, got misplaced, and did not come to light till it was too late for this month. It will be given in our next. He will please accept this apology.

STRANGE THINGS.

"LOOK ON THIS PICTURE."

"*Resolved*, That we hail the emancipation of the sons of Abraham from their long, cruel, and ignominious political and religious bondage to the Gentile powers of earth, as another evidence of God's faithfulness in fulfilling his word; and especially that portion recorded by Isa. 10: 27."

[That text reads thus: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulders, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing."]

"AND ON THIS."

"*Resolved*, That while we look upon the late permit of the Ottoman government to the Jews, to build a Synagogue in Jerusalem, as another sign of the final loosing of the "bands" from the "neck" of the "captive daughter of Zion," we see no evidence of the return of the rejectors, despisers, and contemners of the man of Calvary, to the land given to Abraham for an everlasting possession;" but simply the shadow going before the "substance"—"the holy seed."

Who would believe us if we were to tell them that the above *Resolutions* were both passed by the same identical body, at one sitting, and the one following the other! Yet such is the fact. They can see "God's faithfulness in fulfilling his word" to "the sons of Abraham." Isa. 10: 27, when the work *is done*, and is palpable before their eyes, even

to "the rejecters" of Christ; BUT they can "see *no evidence* of" "God's faithfulness in fulfilling his word," Isa. 11: 12 and 13, as follows:

"And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim."

And these *Resolvers* can "see no evidence" that God intends faithfully to fulfill "his word" by Ezekiel 37: 21 and 22, thus recorded:

"And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land. And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

No; in all these faithful promises, much more clear and explicit than that in Isa. 10: 27, they can "see no evidence" of God's design that they shall be fulfilled. Such blind unbelief grieves us; and it grieves us the more as being evidence of an obstinate adherence to a principle which they had fondly cherished and advocated up to the time the revolution in France took place, February, 1848, viz: "That all God's promises to the literal 'sons of Abraham' were *conditional*, and they having failed in performing those conditions *nothing* remained for them, but their utter destruction." Now, when these *Resolvers* cannot help it, because facts stare them in the face, instead of frankly acknowledging their previous mistake, they come forward and claim credit for discovering God is faithful in "fulfilling his word;" but, put in a disclaimer against his fulfilling any more of it to "the sons of Abraham," those "rejectors of the man of Calvary." We hardly know which to pity most, "the rejectors of the man of Calvary," or "the rejectors of" God's words by Isa. 11: 12, 13; and Ezekiel 27: 21, 22. Both, we believe, have done these things "ignorantly in unbelief;" and, therefore, we trust, both may find "mercy."

"STRONG DELUSION."—*What* is a "strong delusion?" Answer:—"The belief of the return of the Jews to the land of Palestine." So says one of our esteemed cotemporaries in the editorial fraternity. Now, we think, he is quite as likely to have fallen into a "strong delusion" in rejecting that "belief." We wish he, and all others who speak in that strong language, on that subject, would remember that they hold their position by *mere* "*inferences*," and we do sincerely desire, that they would ponder well the following language,—"And Balaam lifted up his eyes, and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes, and the Spirit of God came upon him; and he took up his parable and said * * * How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! * * * He couched, he lay down as a lion, as a great lion; who shall stir him up? *Blessed is he that blesseth thee,* AND CURSED IS HE THAT CURSETH THEE." That he is *now* being "*stirred up*" admits of no doubt. Let those who despise and contemn that people beware that they do not find *themselves* in a "strong delusion." We beg of them, in love, to spare themselves; and wait patiently, in a state of preparation, for the development of providence in that matter, whatever their *opinions* are; they may be mistaken.

THE TRUE WESLEYAN.

We have before spoken of The True Wesleyan, a paper published in New York, by "The Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America," and edited by Rev. Luther Lee. We again say, as in our previous notice, there is not one of our exchanges we are better pleased with than the Wesleyan, though we differ much with it in some things; but we do not expect to find all seeing eye to eye till our Lord Jesus returns to sit on "The throne of his father David." The Wesleyan has copied from the Examiner several of the articles of Bro. W. H. Brewster: but gave nothing of Br. Walsh's replies. This it had a perfect right to do, and we do not complain; though we would have been glad to see both sides in that paper as they are in our own. It also gave a single expression from our article, in our January number, on "reason and its use," which, standing by itself, without reference to its connection, was calculated to make an unfavourable impression in regard to us; especially, as it was headed—"DOGMATICAL." But, we have no complaint to make; we love Brother Lee none the less for that. In the True Wesleyan of February 3, the editor comes out with the following:—

"A DESTRUCTIONIST IN DISGUISE.—Rev. George Storrs, of the Bible Examiner, makes the following announcement:

"THE DOCTRINES you advocate are taking root more extensively than you may be aware off. So writes an eminent Methodist preacher to us, whose name, at present, we are not at liberty to give."

We have no means of knowing who this eminent Methodist preacher is, nor which branch of the Methodist family he belongs to, but to say nothing about dishonesty, he is, beyond all dispute, a *coward*. How any man can reconcile it with honesty, to hold and conceal such principles under the profession, of an eminent Methodist preacher, is more than we can understand. He knows he is deceiving his brethren. The "doctrine" referred to is, that man has no soul, which does or can survive the body. The doctrine is, that the mind is a mere quality or function of the body, and not spirit."

If the True Wesleyan did *know* who the "Methodist Preacher" is, it would not doubt that he is "*eminent*," though he makes no "*profession*" of it. Our brother editor, undesignedly, we have no doubt, misstates "the doctrine" of the editor of the Exam-

iner, to whom the Preacher in question wrote. He says, "The doctrine referred to is, that man has no soul which does or can survive the body." Now *we* never held *such* "doctrine." We most firmly believe the soul does survive the body; but, *not in a state of consciousness*; it *sleeps*, and "knows not anything" till the resurrection, "at the last day," for, "there is *no knowledge* in *sheol* (the state of the dead) whither thou goest"; Eccl. 9: 10.

The Methodist preacher who wrote us, says our brother editor, "is, beyond all dispute, a *coward*." Wherein is he a *coward*? Does he say he is a "disguised" believer of "the doctrine" the True Wesleyan condemns? Not at all. What does he say? In writing to the senior editor of the Examiner he says, "The doctrines you advocate are taking root more extensively than you may be aware of." That is not saying one word about *his* faith—it is simply stating a fact; an alarming one, it seems to the Wesleyan, and it at once scents out one who "holds and conceals principles"—"a coward"—one wanting in "honesty"—and one who "*knows* he is *deceiving* his brethren." Is it a "*dreadful heresy*" for a brother to state a *fact*? Even if he believes those doctrines, which the alarming expression does not affirm, is he therefore "a *coward*" for not avowing that belief publicly? If he is, there are many such; and have been in all ages of the world; and among them, the FOUNDER of "The Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America," at one period of his life; and that not long prior to founding that church, as we have ample means to show. We were intimate with him, and held correspondence with him for some time on the end of the wicked. In one of his first letters to us, after we had frankly stated to him our views on the subject, he says:—

"I cannot say that I *unhesitatingly* believe in the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked. This idea is almost too horrible to be reconciled with the perfections of God. I have had doubts on this point for many years, and the idea of no future punishment is shocking to human reason! Destruction or restoration are, then, the only alternatives. And I confess, so far as I can now see, there is more scripture and perhaps more reason for the former, than for the latter But I am pretty well persuaded, one of these theories I shall be obliged to embrace, in order to reconcile my religious views with scripture, reason, and the perfections of God."

We have stronger "meat" than this, from the same source, for our brother of the True Wesleyan, if he calls for it. Was *that* brother, at the time we refer to, "a *coward*?" Did "he know he" was "deceiving his brethren?" Was his "honesty" to be called in question? Do not drive too furiously, brother Wesleyan. You know very well that it is no easy matter, though the understanding may be convinced, to bring the feelings up to the point of sundering all those relations which we have with particular communities and churches: and we often try various expedients to see if we cannot retain those relations and keep a good conscience. It frequently happens that these relations are so strong that nothing but the most intolerant spirit drives us out of the connection. If the "eminent Methodist preacher" were a member of the Wesleyan Church such remarks as those of our brother editor would have a strong tendency to make him leave it. It will be recollected that some months since, we copied an editorial article from the True Weleyan under the caption "Pride of Opinion"—and a most excellent article it was; showing that men have often occasion to change their opinion; and in fact, that there is no progress without it. While the mind is in this transforming state, it is not so easy, nor is it always best, too hastily to announce our convictions; but, when the mind has become fully satisfied that previous opinions are wrong, and that others are really the truth, we think, the sooner the avowal is made the more likely is the individual himself to escape the snare of being "again entangled" in his old opinions "and overcome," and so "his last state be worse than the first." God does not give light to have it hid under a bushel; but judgment may be used as to the most suitable time to manifest that light. Said the Saviour to his disciples, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*." Was he "a *coward*?" Was he "*dishonest*?" We hope the "Methodist preacher," who is the innocent occasion of these remarks, will see his way clear fully to embrace and publicly to declare his faith in the glorious Bible truth, "*No immortality out of Christ; no incorruption to man except by a resurrection from the dead: and no endless life except as the gift of God through Jesus Christ.*" In conclusion, we say, *another* very eminent preacher in the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection in America," who does not agree with the doctrines we advocate, wrote us a few months ago, among other things, as follows:—

"I am no bigot, I could unite with you in church fellowship, with your present views, were it practical. * * * My objection would not be to uniting in church fellowship with persons who hold your views, but to the consequences of bringing such discordant views together in the same association."

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

EPHESIANS, PART OF CHAPTER II.

In reading the Scriptures we should keep in mind that the division into chapters and verses is not inspiration; neither is the punctuation: this is all of man. In the chapter before us, the connection with the previous one should not be interrupted; it is only carrying forward the subject. The apostle had stated clearly what God's design is, in reference to those who become "holy and without blame before him in love," *viz.*, their "adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself"—which adoption—as we have shown—is immortality, incorruptibility—endless life. In what manner this

adoption should take place he presented to the "eyes of" our "understanding" from the contemplation of "God's mighty power," manifested in his work in raising "Christ from the dead," and setting "him at his own right hand"—next in power to himself—"in heavenly places" or *things*; * * * "and gave him to be head over all things to his church, which [church] is *his body*, the fulness [*completion*, or perfection] of him that filleth all in all." By such power God made it manifest and certain that as Christ, the head, was raised from the dead and exalted to immortality, incorruptibility, endless life, so should "his body"—the church—all who become "holy and without blame before him in love"—be also glorified with the same "adoption of children by Jesus Christ." The apostle then proceeds to say:

VERSE 1. And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins.

As the word "*quickened*" is not in the original, it would seem as proper to use in its place the word "*filled*," as that closes the previous verse, and appears to be in the apostle's mind. However, we will contemplate the subject in reference to both expressions. The Ephesians were dead in trespasses and sins—a figurative expression. What is it to be dead? Modern theology makes it a state of consciousness; but we conceive it is just the reverse—that is, it is a state of unconsciousness. Through sin the Ephesians were unconscious of the power of God, and "*knew not anything*" of God's design and purpose to raise those who should hear "the word of truth," and obey it, to the "adoption of children." But when the word of truth was embraced by them, the spirit of life from God, even that power of life manifested in raising Christ from the dead, "*filled*" them, and they were "made partakers of the divine nature," or a life principle from God, which is the earnest of their future adoption after the pattern of Christ's adoption.

If, however, we use the word *quickened*, the illustration is beautiful; thus—They were dead in sins—unconscious, as we said before—like as Adam when formed of the dust was a perfect man, but there was *no life* in him—he was lifeless. But, "God breathed upon his face the breath of life" and he started up a *living* being—or, was quickened into life. So every man has a capability to develope spiritual or divine life; yet ignorance prevents such development, and he remains in a state of death, or destitution of divine life; when, however, he hears "the word of truth, the gospel of his salvation," or God's kind design to give the "adoption of children," to the *holy*—believing that word—he is quickened by its power: and "the eyes of his understanding being enlightened" to see the great gospel truth of the adoption, as exemplified in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, though he sees things indistinct, as the man who saw men as trees walking, yet he is mightily invigorated and strengthened to "arise from the dead," that "Christ" may give him "light," or more life: see chap. 5: 14. Hitherto he had been living in sin and was unconscious—like a dead man—or was dead in trespasses and sins.

VERSE 2. Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.

"Ye walked according to"—or, in conformity with—"the course of this world"—or age: which course or manner of life was—"according to"—or, in conformity with—"the prince of the power of the air." This spirit worketh in the children of disobedience"—it worketh blindness, hardness of heart, and obstinate unbelief. So there are two opposite spirits in the world: one works in willing believing hearts, holiness and love: the other works in obstinate unbelieving minds, sin and death. These last are children of disobedience.

VERSE 3. Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

"Among whom"—the children of disobedience—"we all had our conversation"—course of life—"in times past in the lusts"—desires—"of our flesh"—or, animal nature—"and of the mind"—or, imaginations—"and were by nature"—were *truly*—"children of wrath, even as [those] others." The expression, "*by nature*," refers to *fact*, and not to some fancied inherent principle, as some suppose. Thus Paul says—"When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do *by nature* the things contained in the law," [Rom. 2: 14,] it is manifest he means "*truly do*." The original word is the same in both texts. The wicked course of the children of disobedience made them truly,—really—deserving of wrath, or displeasure. But mark well. It was their own trespasses and sins, and not the sin of another, that made them truly children of wrath.

VERSE 4–6. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved:) And hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus.

"God who is *rich* in mercy,"—distinguished for abounding in mercy. Such is the character the apostle gives God. How unlike that given by many in these days. He does not stop at this point, but adds "For his GREAT LOVE wherewith he loved us:" when, Paul? "Even when we were *dead in sins*"—unconscious of his kind designs towards us—even then, so great was his love, that he "quickened us together with Christ"—that same spirit and power which raised up Christ from the dead, passing through Christ, as the only medium of communication to men, came upon us, and quickened us to consciousness of God's kind and loving design to give to sinners, renewed, made holy and unblamable in love, the adoption of children to himself: and, having quickened us, "raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly *things* in Christ Jesus;" being made partakers of the Holy Spirit—the divine nature—and thus giving us to "taste the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come;" see Heb. 6: 5.

VERSE 7. That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in *his* kindness toward us through Christ Jesus.

We know of nothing that can be said upon this verse only, that you read it over again and again, and put emphasis on every word it contains; and you will find "*exceeding riches*," and those riches will be continually unfolding in "THE AGES to come:" how that God in his love took us, "whose foundation is in the dust," raised us up, first to animal life—then to intellectual life—next to spiritual life; and then to immortality—partakers of his own

incorruptibility, one with God, even as Christ and God are now one: see John 17: 21, 22. Such "riches of God's grace" may well require "*ages*" to unfold and manifest. Oh, "that the eyes of" all "our understandings may be enlightened, to know what is the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints," &c.; see again, chap. 1: 18–20.

VERSE 8–9. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; *it is* the gift of God. Not of works least any man should boast.

This great salvation is of the favor of God, but "through faith"—through our believing "the word of truth" [chap. 1: 13,] "the gospel"—the good news —"of our salvation," for "the adoption of children." In a certain sense "faith is not of ourselves:" that is—there must be evidence to induce belief; for, "faith cometh by hearing;" [Rom. 10: 17.] God gives faith to men by sending the word of truth to them. But we believe the apostle speaks simply of the salvation not being of themselves—*that* "is the gift of God" to them who believe the word of the truth of his love, and gracious designs of adopting them as children. That this is the apostle's meaning is evident from the words that follow.—"Not of works"—what *is not of works*? The salvation. What mortal, corruptible child of Adam, could ever possess the pride of heart to suppose he could attain to the divine nature, and share in its incorruptibility, by any works he might perform? Nay, when we have attained even to holiness and an unblamable love it is still of grace—riches of grace, or favor—that we now share the "earnest," or shall hereafter partake of the reality of that glory that is to be revealed in us at the time appointed of the Father. But though it is not of works, "lest" we "should boast," yet we are to walk in good works.

VERSE 10. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

"For we are his workmanship, created"—*ktisthentes*—renewed, regenerated, renovated—"*in* Christ Jesus." Our creation in Adam was only the creation of an intellectual animal: nothing higher—nothing more: and, for ought that appears to the contrary, if Adam had not sinned, nor any of his posterity, he and they must have been created—regenerated—*in* Christ Jesus, who is the head of the *spiritual* creation, ever to have attained spiritual life, or to have been partakers of the divine nature; without which they are incapable of performing *morally* good works, and have no qualifications for immortality, nor title to the inheritance of incorruptibility and endless life. This spiritual creation being *in* and through Jesus Christ, is "unto good works." Those who have experienced its beginning just as naturally *act* like Christ, or act spiritual life, as those born of Adam act animal life; consequently, become holy and without blame before God in love; which is according to God's ordinance, or previous determination; and for which the regeneration has "prepared them." Obedience, therefore, or good works, is not only a design of God in their new or spiritual creation, but is also evidence of union to the head of that creation; and without which works all pretensions to being in Christ are void; for "God hath before ordained"—*proetoimasen*—prepared beforehand—"that we should walk"—*peripatesomen*—travel, or live—"in them." God prepared before the creation of the earthly Adam a spiritual head through whom to bring out in man a moral, spiritual, or divine nature, that should be manifested in good works as the course of life, by all its possessors; not to manifest it, is evidence that we have it not.

TRUTH DEFENDED.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN AND THROUGH CHRIST.

EDWARD WHITE, Congregational Minister, Hereford, England, in the "*Dedication*" of his "LIFE IN CHRIST," A. D. 1846, says, p. vii.—

"In the last century the learned Dodwell collected an important mass of evidence to prove, and successfully defended that evidence against many vehement adversaries, that the idea of the native immortality of all men, was not sanctioned by the primitive Church. It will be a difficult task to overthrow or undermine some of the testimonies which were adduced in that controversy, either by the allegation of false quotation, or by endeavouring to underrate the value of the witnesses. IRENÆUS, for instance, the disciple of Polycarp, who was the scholar of the Apostle John, thus writes: "Life is not from ourselves, nor from our nature, but it is given or bestowed according to the grace of God; and therefore he who preserves this gift of life, and returns thanks to Him who bestows it, he shall receive 'length of days for ever and ever.' But he who rejects it, and proves unthankful to his Maker for creating him, and will not know him who bestows it, *he deprives himself of the gift of duration to all eternity.* And therefore the Lord speaks thus of such unthankful persons: 'If you have not been faithful in that which is least, who will commit much to you?' intimating thereby unto us, that they who are unthankful to him with respect to this short transitory life, which is his gift, the effect of his bounty, *shall be most justly deprived of length of days in the world to come.*"

In speaking of the progress of truth on the non-immortality of corruptible man, he says he has it from the late "distinguished writer, Mr. Foster," that—

"*A number of ministers, not large, but of great piety and intelligence, within his acquaintance, had been disbelievers in the doctrine in question,* (the eternal existence of the wicked in misery,) at the same time, not feeling themselves imperatively, called upon to make a public disavowal: content with employing in their ministrations strong general terms in denouncing the doom of impenitent sinners. For one thing, a consideration of the unreasonable imputations and unmeasured suspicions apt to be cast on any publicly declared partial defection from rigid orthodoxy, has made them think they should better consult their usefulness by not giving a prominence to this dissentient point; while yet they made no concealment of it in private communications, or in answer to serious inquiries."

Mr. White then proceeds to say:—

"In self-defence, I may add to this instructive and remarkable testimony, my own, that I, also, am acquainted with several very excellent and accomplished ministers of the gospel and editors of religious periodicals similarly situated.

The antiquity of the theological views here

defended, together with their partial suppression by "pious" and "intelligent" men, offer, therefore, an impressive illustration of the truth of Lord Bacon's memorable reflection: "Another error," says this great author, in his *Advancement of Learning*.—"Another error, is a conceit, that of former opinions or sects, after variety and examination, the best hath still prevailed and suppressed the rest; so as, if a man should begin the labour of a new search, he were but like to light upon somewhat formerly rejected, and by rejection brought into oblivion; as if the multitude *or the wisest for the multitude's sake*, were not ready to give passage rather to that which is popular and superficial, than to that which is substantial and profound. For the truth is, that Time seemeth to be of the nature of a river or stream, which carrieth down to us that which is light and blown up, and sinketh and drowneth that which is weighty and solid.'"

We now proceed to give an extract from his "First Discourse. We commence page 12. He says:—

We feel bound to admit, that unassisted nature, as is proved by the remains of the pagan philosophers, and by the clashing opinions of modern metaphysicians, can attain *no certainty whatever* on this subject of eternal Immortality in the soul; and a clever materialist can bring forward many appearances which oppose, at the outset, at least a formidable barrier to so grand a conclusion. The wiser advocates of the theory, therefore, have in recent years generally depended upon what they consider to be the declarations of Scripture supporting the view which they take of man's constitution. * * * * *

Gen. ii. 7: "*So God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.*" From this passage it is alleged that the breath of the Eternal must be everlasting; and that the expression, "living soul," signifies an ever-living intelligence. It is undeniable that these words indicate some special dignity in human nature, distinguishing it from those animal races which the "*earth* brought forth" at the command of the Almighty. But it is not so clear that this special dignity consisted in immortality of the soul; at least, it is not clear from the phrase, "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" for the fact that his "breath was in his nostrils" is subsequently adduced by the Divine Spirit (Isaiah ii. 22) as an argument of man's fragility; and in the original language the beasts which perished in the deluge, are declared to have possessed equally with mankind "the breath of lives," (*nishmath chaiim.*) Gen. vii. 22. We venture to conclude, therefore, that although the life of Adam was the breath of God, and although he was formed in the Divine image, and specially moulded by the Divine hands, that yet this by no means proves human immortality. And in the second place, the allegation of the phrase "living soul," in vindication of the doctrine, is peculiarly unhappy, inasmuch as it may be demonstrated to be the phrase appropriated in Scripture to denote an animal nature, in the strongest contrast to one which is properly spiritual and eternal. For example, we read in Genesis ix. 10, that "God established his covenant with every living creature (Heb. *nephesh hayah*, living soul) that accompanied Noah into the ark, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of the beast of the earth." It is translated in the Septuagint, both here and in Gen. ii. 7, *psuche zosa*, which also are the words employed by St. John (Rev. xvi. 3) to denote the *fishes* that died in the sea at the occurrence of some destructive prophetical calamity. Accordingly, the Apostle Paul adduces the text in question, for the express purpose of drawing the most marked contrast between the first and the second Adam. He says (1 Cor. xv. 44,) "There is a natural, or an *animal* body, (*psuchikon*, an adjective derived from the translated *soul*, in Gen. ii. 7,) and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written: The first man Adam was made a living soul (*psuche zosa*,) the last Adam was made a quickening or life-giving spirit, *zoopoioun pneuma*. The first man was of the earth, earthy, *choikos*, a man of dust; the second Adam is the Lord from heaven." Thus we perceive that, instead of applying the term *soul* to the mind of man, the Apostle refers it to his whole nature, but with a special reference to the *body;* while he points out the fact, that the first Adam was only a *living* soul, possessing no principle of essential vitality; and that the second Adam is a life-*giving* spirit, having "Life in himself" as God. On the whole, then, we must decide, that so far from intending to teach the immortality of the soul in the text before us, Moses was speaking of the compound nature of Adam, with an eye chiefly to his animal part, and with a pointed intimation of its mortality, or possible decay.

The next passage of Scripture usually alleged in support of the common doctrine is Ecclesiastes iii. 21, "*Who knoweth the spirit of a man which goeth upwards, and the spirit of a beast which goeth downwards to the earth?*" It is presumed that the expression "goeth upwards" denotes not merely survivance, which may be readily granted, but eternal immortality. A slight reference to the context, however, will show that Solomon, the wisest man, not an Epicurean infidel, as some persons assert, is engaged in speculating upon the great similarity discoverable between mankind and the animal races, and he expresses the wish that God would undeceive them in the matter of their boasted essential immortality, and bring them to a humble sense of their true rank in the scale of creation. And he remarks, in conclusion, that the extreme uncertainty hanging over the state of the spirit when separated from the body, under the dispensation then present, leads him to place but little dependence upon the grand meditations of philosophers and others on the exalted blessedness of disembodied souls, and to conclude that the most fitting course was to make the best use of our brief vain life in the body; not denying, as afterwards appears, the hope of a resurrection. "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, O that God might manifest them, that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath: so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go to one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of a man that goeth upward, and the spirit of a beast that goeth downwards to the earth? Wherefore I perceive that there is nothing better than that a man should rejoice in his

own works, for that is his portion, for who shall bring him to see what shall be after him?"

It is evident that the words in the twelfth chapter of this same book (Eccl. xii. 7,) "*the spirit shall return to God who gave it,*" so far from deciding in favor of an eternal duration, do not even explicitly teach its separate existence at all; since "returning unto God" would either signify, in Oriental language, a lapse of the individual mind into the Divine infinity, or, more probably, would refer to the Spirit of life from God, as in Job xxxiv. 14.

The words of Paul in 2 Tim. i. 10, are sometimes adduced in proof of human immortality, "*Who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.*" It is affirmed that the Apostle here teaches us, that Christ brought to light the fact that all men are by nature immortal. But is it not the more natural interpretation, that the Saviour brought life and immortality, that is, immortal life, to a world which had lost it? especially since he prefaces the statement by declaring that Christ *hath abolished death.* In every other instance, however, the terms *life* and *immortality* are understood by these writers to signify, not eternal existence, but simply eternal happiness, and it remains for them to exhibit the rule by which they forsake their usual interpretation in this case, and affix to the words of the Apostle a literal signification. The figurative exposition of the Scripture should at least be consistently carried out; even though it is evident that the result would in the present text be (if, as it is also asserted, the proposition is universal) to declare and pronounce the eternal salvation of the whole race of mankind.

Besides these, we have not met with any passages of Scripture advanced as abstract declarations of human immortality. We shall hope to make it appear hereafter that wherever the Bible speaks of the future existence of the righteous and the wicked, that existence, of whatever duration, is not to be attributed to man's inherent perpetuity of being.*

We are constrained therefore to adopt the conclusion, humbly but firmly, that the Divine Revelation does not teach the doctrine commonly entertained upon the nature of the human soul; but that it is a splendid fiction of philosophy, suggested by the tempter who at first beguiled Eve with the declaration, "YE SHALL NOT SURELY DIE."

1. For, in the first place, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is never once explicitly delivered throughout the entire range of the canon of Scripture; a very remarkable silence, which may well suggest some misgivings in bar of implicit belief in those Christian theologians whose works are filled with descriptions of the "intrinsic dignity of man's immortal soul." If the doctrine in question be true, that the spirit of man is an undying intelligence, an everlasting and indestructible power, we surely might expect to discover at least some few traces of a general recognition of this grand fundamental, in the ages which were illustrated by perpetual communications with heaven. In ancient times neither men nor languages were so differently framed from those of a more recent era, as to avoid through a long course of centuries every apparent reference to an idea which is alleged to lie at the basis of the scheme of redemption through all its dispensations. In every other instance we obtain from the Prophets and Apostles clear and frequent enunciations of the doctrines which they were commissioned to deliver; even of those which unaided reason was able to discover, as the existence of God, and the difference between virtue and vice. But in this instance they have, by some astonishing fatality, omitted, with one consent, all reference to the immortality of the soul; no single verse of the Bible containing that brief declaration which would have set the controversy for ever at rest. In our own times, scarcely a religious work issues from the press addressed to thoughtless mankind; scarcely is a public exhortation directed to them without a full and forcible exhibition of the doctrine of natural or actual immortality, of deathless existence, as the basis of the whole theological superstructure. Now, how shall we explain the remarkable fact, that neither prophets nor apostles have ever once employed this argument in dealing with the wicked? an argument so apposite and irresistible, if it be true? How, otherwise than by determining that this was not their philosophy; that this doctrine formed no part of the "wisdom" of Him whose thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor His ways as our ways.

It will not be further contended, that the doctrine is every where taken for granted, as universally understood and acknowledged; for that was not clearer in antiquity, which is so dark in more civilised ages; and it is impossible to believe that those writers who are copious to an almost painful minuteness in the details of a ceremonial economy, or of ecclesiastical arrangements, and in refutations of the cavils of every variety of heretical apostasy, should yet not have expended a line in defence of a truth which is liable to such deadly attacks, and which is, notwithstanding, asserted to be the very foundation of religion.

2. In the second place, we may notice, as strongly opposed to the notion of the soul's immortality, the style and tone adopted in the Scripture when speaking discursively of man's natural estate; a style infinitely unsuitable when adverting to a Being endowed with the sublime, the magnificent, attribute of eternal existence. For example, we find, in addition to the extraordinary silence already noted, such language as the following, from the lips of Job and his friends, which may be taken as a fair estimate of the patriarchal orthodoxy on the subject before us.

Chap. vii.—"O remember that my life is wind, mine eye shall no more see good. Am I a sea, or a whale, that thou settest a watch over me? I would not live alway; let me alone; for my days are vanity. What is man that thou shouldst magnify him, and that thou shouldst set thine heart upon him? and that thou shouldst visit him every morning, and try him every moment?"

Chapter x.—"Are thy days as the days of man, are thy years as man's days, that thou inquirest after mine iniquity, and searchest afrer my sin? Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made me as the clay; and wilt thou turn me unto dust again?"

Chapters xi.—xiv. "He knoweth vain man," adds the patriarch, "he seeth their wickedness

*The text, 1 Cor. xv. 22, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," is clearly proved by Dr. Wardlaw to refer only to the righteous. Essay on Pardon, p. 267, a work directed to the overthrow of Mr. Erskine's opinions.

also. For vain man would be wise, though man be born like the wild ass's colt. Man that is born of a woman is of a few days, and full of trouble; he cometh forth as a flower, and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not. And dost thou open thine eyes upon such an one," continues Job, "and bringest me in judgment with thee? Wilt thou break a leaf driven to and fro, and wilt thou pursue the dry stubble? Behold, even to the moon, and it shineth not; yea, the stars are not pure in his sight. How much less man that is a worm, and the son of man that is a worm."

Chapter xl.—"If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust. Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer thee? Once have I spoken, but I will not answer; yea twice, but I will proceed no farther."

Again, David and Isaiah re-echo the same humble strain: "What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?" "All nations before Him are as *nothing*, yea less than nothing and vanity."

Language of this strongly depreciatory character is constantly employed by these ancient philosophers when describing the estate of the sons of men; not merely when animadverting on their moral character, but when measuring the dignity of their nature. But if man be by constitution, AN IMMORTAL in his soul, the mortality of his body is an inconsiderable circumstance—rather a blessing than a curse; and we might inquire with a recent author, contending in a very different tone for the common theory, "How MUCH LESS IS IT THAN TO BE DIVINE TO BE IMMORTAL? Certain it is, however, that the style adopted by the inspired writers upon the emptiness and worthlessness of man is extremely unsuitable to a being whose "soul is more noble and enduring than the whole material universe;" for, in fact, they never, by any chance, rise into the employment of these exalted encomiums upon human dignity, adhering, with astonishing pertinacity to the most degrading images and mortifying representations.

SYMBOLS—THEIR INTERPRETATION.

BRO. STORRS.—With your permission I will notice very briefly an article from a correspondent in the last "Examiner," entitled "The twenty-three hundred days."

There are some very simple rules, in interpreting symbolical prophesy, which are often overlooked, because of its simplicity. 1st. When a symbolical representation is presented, and an explanation is required, the principle is always involved, that the *object seen* stands as a representative of something else, and never for the *object or thing* then represented. 2d. That all the parts connected with a symbolical painting must be harmonious; and when a period of time is connected with a symbol, the *time* also must be symbolical.

The correspondent referred to above supposes that the 2300 days of Daniel 8: 13, are *literal* days. Let us examine this.

What does the prophet see in vision? The first thing seen is *a ram* before the river with two horns, and one was higher than the other; and the highest came up last, and pushed westward and northward and southward, and no beast could stand before him. The reader will observe that this symbolical beast is explained in the 20th verse to be *Media Persia*, and is first seen in the meridian of its power and glory. After which a *he-goat*, with one horn, was seen on the symbolical canvass; and when he was strong the great horn was broken, and four notable ones came up towards the four winds of heaven. In the 22d verse this beast is called *Grecia*.

After this *a little horn* came up out of one of the four winds of heaven, (the west, or Italy, for winds of heaven is the antecedent,) and this little horn *waxed exceeding great* towards the south, and towards the east, and towards the pleasant land, and cast the truth to the ground. This exceeding great horn cast also some of the host as well as the stars to the ground, and by reason of transgression a host was given him against the daily. This symbolical horn is explained to be "a king of fierce countenance," (see Deut. 28: 49, 50,) who arose in the latter time of the four divisions of the Grecian kingdom, and is to be broken without hands in the *last end* of the indignation, at the *time appointed*. In this symbolical representation, Daniel saw three successive powers represented by three distinct symbols. This representation is called "*the vision*." The question is now asked, in the 13th verse, "*how long the vision?*" What vision? That which Daniel has been considering—*the ram*, the *he-goat*, and *the little horn*, which afterwards became *exceeding great*. How long did these beasts live? How long did they, as *the daily*, and afterwards as *the transgression of desolation*, tread under foot, with their impure feet, both the sanctuary and the host. The answer is given in part, "unto 2300 days; *then* shall the sanctuary be cleansed." We have then as symbols, *literal beasts* to represent kingdoms. We have also as a symbol, *literal days* for the lifetime of these beasts, to represent *the time* in vision, beginning with the greatest glory of Media Persia, and reaching down to the last end of the indignation, or when the sanctuary shall begin to be cleansed.

With this exposition all is simple. Here are *literal beasts* and *literal days*, that are used as symbols to represent *kingdoms and their duration* for a certain period of time. These *principles of interpretation* commend themselves to the understanding, and we see not how they can be controverted. The difficulty in most minds on this subject is the *inference* or interpretation they give of what the cleansing of the sanctuary is. This has been the cause or reason why some persons have attempted to construct a new chronology for every revolving year since 43 and 44. A great deal has been said about "a circle of years in which chronologers are not agreed," by which many have been led to suppose that there is at *this day* a disagreement among those who are competent to investigate the subject. That there has been, in past periods, is true; but as science and astronomy have shed their bright light on the history of the past, especially so far back as the time of Cyrus, no one that consults the evidence but accords to Drs. Hale, Prideaux, Jarvis and others, the general outlines given. Is the sanctuary that was trodden under foot by these unclean beasts in vision symbolical? Was it the same typical sanctuary that Daniel prayed about in the 9th chapter *then desolate*? If it was, then the antitype must be looked for as being something different from that of the symbol or type. If the negative is taken from the fact that there is no symbol of a sanctuary given in the vision, then another step is taken in the proof that the authority and power of these symbolized governments over the mind and affections was the sanctuary which was to go through the cleansing process at the end of the 2300 days.

The answer, how long the *host* (the body or the antitype of the temple of God which contained the sanctuary) should be trodden under foot by these symbolical beasts is not given. Has the cleansing operation began? Look abroad upon the world. Do we not see the *stone* striking the image on the feet? Are not thrones being cast down? These things show that we have come

down in chronology to the time symbolized or personified by the *Ancient of days*, when neither the affections or the bodies of God's people shall be subject to the control or dictation of these wild beasts. "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever."

In conclusion it would be well to remark, that in examining the symbols of Daniel, and the book of "the Revelation of Jesus Christ," a distinction should be made between the symbol and its interpretation. Most expositors have overlooked some of the most simple rules of explaining the apocalyptical vision of John, by interpreting part of the objects seen on the symbolical canvass as the signs of other things, whilst other objects seen in the same vision stand for the very things themselves there seen.

When we have found the meaning of a symbol, such as *the sun*, *the stars*, *trumpet*, *pit*, *lake of fire*, *Satan*, &c. &c., if the same symbol is used the second time in the same book, it can never have a different or even a literal meaning. That the book is a book of signs see the first verse,—"*signified*," made known to John by the angel, by signs or symbols. It may help some minds in their investigations, to know the fact that the symbols in this book are most, if not all, taken from the word of God, the other books of which were previously written. Even some of the symbols of Daniel are used again as symbols, to show in "*the revelation of Jesus Christ*" "things which must" (not had) "shortly come to pass."

C. B. Hotchkiss.

Auburn, N. Y., Nov. 6, 1848.

Notice.—The Editor of the Examiner designs to be in New York City Wednesday and Thursday, the 28th and 29th of this month. He will be glad to meet the friends there at any place they may appoint.

PERSONAL REIGN OF CHRIST.

Isa. 9. Luke 1. Acts 1.

Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, was the first gentile king who obtained universal dominion; and the God of Heaven showed him a great image, ninety feet high, of terrible form and excellent brightness, which was a type of the whole gentile dispensation, commencing with Nebuchadnezzar, who was the head of gold, descending to the silver, which is the Medo Persian—then to the brass, which is the Macedonian—then to the iron, which is the Roman—then to the clay and iron, which is the ten divisions of the Roman Empire, part strong and part broken; in which age the God of Heaven shall strike the image on its toes with that stone on which Israel stumbled and fell; which stone falling on the gentile dispensation, in these last days, shall grind to powder the clay, the iron, the brass, the silver and the gold, and set up the Kingdom of God, which shall last for ever, 2 Samuel 7: 12; Daniel 2: 44.

Daniel's little horn is the 11th Kingdom, which was to endure and practice wickedness 1260 years, and is Paul's man of sin—the Pope of Rome is He. John's wicked lady is the Church of Rome—her merchants are the preachers of her corruptions. whose doctrine has intoxicated all nations so as to constitute the Apostacy, so that men will not endure sound doctrine, but piously believe lies. Paul says, He (the Pope) shall be destroyed by the light of the coming of the King of Israel; and John says, God shall sink Rome to Hell beneath her. I presume to say, with one more wise, "Vesuvius and Etna are the chimneys" of the hell into which Rome will soon sink like a mill stone. All the prophets and apostles have predicted these judgments, and will rejoice at the destruction of the Man of Sin and his seat, Rev. 18: 20; and yet Pope Pius IX. prays the virgin "Mary, Paul and Peter" (who are dead) to pray for him, and for God to turn away his judgment from Rome. Rev. 17 and 18 c.

Republicanism is now dismembering every government on the face of the whole earth, and will soon fill the world with that state of anarchy contemplated in Luke 21: 26. This has partially obtained in Europe, and will soon do so in this country on the ——— question. Then see Luke 26: 31 and 27. Jesus was born heir to the throne of David, Luke 1: 32, as Jehovah had promised in 2 Samuel 7: 12; and the general assembly of the apostles say He will return and set it up at the close of the gentile dispensation, Acts 15: 16. He is now on Jehovah's throne. Rev. 3: 21.

Can any words teach more plainly the personal coming and personal reign of Christ on David's throne than Acts 1: 11; Isa. 9: 5 to 7; and ch. 24: 23. This is the gospel as you will see from Luke 9: 2, 6; Acts 28: 31.

I have much to say, but fearing to trouble you I have briefly made these suggestions, respectfully begging you to lay them before your readers on my responsibility.

Hastily, in hope of the kingdom, yours,

Virginia. W. W. J———.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

ECLECTIC PHRENOLOGICAL ADVOCATE.

The Associate Editor of the "Bible Examiner" proposes to publish, in the City of Richmond, Virginia, a monthly periodical of the above title, to be devoted to the exposition and elaboration of the Constitution of Man—mentally, psychologically and morally. It will present, and advocate, a new and beautiful system of mental philosophy, a perfect system of moral science; and elaborate the astounding and important truth, that *man* requires, *constitutionally*, a *Theocratic Government!* It will take the high position, that all *true* philosophy is *Christian* philosophy, and all *true* science *Biblical* science! The constitution of man, in relation to mind, morals, revelation, life, death, mortality, immortality, corruptibility and incorruptibility, will be fully and fearlessly investigated. Erroneous systems of morals and philosophy, which have become, as it were, gray by age, will be analyzed, and their faultiness exposed. Having made *man* our study for more than twelve years, we feel prepared to present to the American public a paper which will *command* the respect, the attention, and the patronage of the intelligent, the thoughtful, and the inquiring. Indeed, we feel confident that every subscriber will receive five times the value of the subscription price of the paper.

Terms.

The Eclectic Phrenological Advocate will be published monthly, 16 8vo. pages to the number, at $1 per annum, payable *always* in advance.

Clubs of *five, one address*, for $4; *ten*, for $7; *fifteen*, for $10; and *twenty*, for $12.

All letters must be addressed, *post paid*, to J. T. Walsh, Richmond, Va.

☞ Editors giving this Prospectus an insertion, and calling attention to it, will be entitled to an exchange.

Richmond, Va. J. T. WALSH.

Feb. 15th, 1849.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1849. No. 4.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

ELOHIM—AND STATE OF THE DEAD.

MR. J. T. WALSH:—*Dear Sir*: In my desire to keep close to the question, I must pass over without notice much of your last article, and not suffer myself to be drawn aside by any issues raised.

Does the soul exist in a conscious state, from death till the resurrection? To maintain the affirmative of the above, I have attempted to prove, in opposition to your views, that man has a spiritual as well as a material nature, and, in common with most men, have denominated that spiritual nature the *mind*. My first proof was, man is the *image* of Jehovah, his Creator.

Two points I thought none would deny: God himself, and not by delegation, created man, and stamped upon him his image. That he is the image of the creating agent, brought to view in Gen. 1st chapter, even you admit.

From this I inferred, that man possessed in addition to a physical body, an immaterial mind,—his body could not be God's likeness, and as God was *wholly spiritual*, a being *wholly material*, could not be in his image.

Now, all your reasoning has granted my *conclusion* to be just from the assumed *premises*. The *only* question between *us* is, are the premises true? Is Jehovah the creating agent brought to view in the first chapter of Genesis? and is man his image? And if so, man has a spiritual nature. Here I hold you, you shall not evade it, you shall not escape from it. Now how do you meet this? By boldly denying that God is the creating agent presented in this history, and asserting that angels are intended by the word rendered God. Let the reader bear in mind, that if you fail here, you yield both the premises and the conclusion. I bind you to it by cords you cannot sunder.

To maintain your position, and repel the force of my deduction, you have introduced a long quotation from Dr. Thomas, whom you denominate the *learned* Dr. Thomas. His criticisms you endorse, and hence I hold you responsible for them. They are now yours by adoption.

Stripped of its learned verbiage to what does it amount? What are the real points, at least, so far as they bear upon this discussion.

God created this world by *delegation*,—the agents employed were angels,—because angels are sometimes called Elohim, and man was created in the *image*, *likeness*, or *form*, of angels, the creating agents.

These are the points. I have no desire to wade through the labyrinth of verbose criticism by which he attempts to sustain these novel views: destitute, it seems to me, of every other recommendation but novelty.

I reply: Creation by delegated powers, is a monstrous absurdity. To create, implies possession of omnipotence, which cannot be delegated. The essential attributes of God cannot be delegated to another.

Besides, what does the agent in the case do? Has he infinite wisdom as well as power? and if not, does he execute the designs and plans of another, or is something less than infinite wisdom to be traced in creation?

Secondly. The creating agent here brought to view, is called in the *second* chapter, the LORD GOD. *chap.* 2: 7. "*And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground.*"

Here is a new title. *Jehovah Elohim.* The word, or name, *Jehovah*, implies self existence, existence without *beginning*, or termination, and is equivalent to the august title, (Ex. 3: 14,) "I AM THAT I AM." See Bush and Clark.

Here the creating agent is the *uncreated, self existent*, infinite JEHOVAH. This title angels cannot bear. He is sometimes called *Jehovah*, sometimes *Elohim*, and at other times the compound title *Jehovah Elohim* is given him.

Thridly. Creation is ascribed to Christ, in the New Testament, and as neither you, nor your learned coadjutor believe him to be *Jehovah*, you make him create by delegation, which shuts out, and uses up all his philosophic arguments in favour of the creation of the world and man by angels.

And farther, I beg the reader to bear in mind, that any interpretation that gives the true meaning of a word, may be substituted for that word when it occurs in the text. Now let us try your interpretation by this rule.

"In the beginning *angels* created the heaven and the earth." "And *angels* said let there be light," —and angels "called the light day." "And angels said let us make man in our FORM." "So angels created man in his (their) own FORM." "And on the seventh day angels ended his (their) work which he (they) had made." "And angels blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because in it he had rested from all the work which angels had created and made." But I have no disposition to follow further this old heathen notion, newly vamped by this learned Dr., which converts God into a recluse, and gives creation and providence to angels.

God claims that, *alone by himself*, he spread out the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth, but Dr. T. thinks this altogether below the infinite dignity of *Jehovah*.

My premises remain untouched, and my conclu-

sion follows. Man has a spiritual and immaterial as well as a physical and material nature.

My whole argument on Phil. 1: 20, 21, &c., is passed with this declaration. "I think you do not understand the passage." This is cool, certainly. How stands the matter? I quoted the text, and believing the meaning so obvious, that comments only obscured it, I offered none, but drew an inference from the text as generally understood. The *inference* I supposed you would deny and attack. This, however, you did not do; thus granting the inference to be a true one, from the general view of the passage; i. e., if Paul had a desire to die, because then he should be with Christ,—if death would be gain to *him*, then my doctrine is true.

I beg the reader to observe this. Here then is another point gained. The meaning of the text is the only point in discussion; and if I maintain *my* interpretation, *you* are bound, in honesty, to concede the correctness of my theory as to a future existence.

Your interpretation I think I did fairly refute by establishing *beyond* refutation my own interpretation. But as you think I did not, I will notice your interpretation. Before I proceed, let me state once more the points of question. Did Paul regard it gain to him *personally*, to die? and was the fact that he should be with Christ a reason why he desired to die?

You maintain that his death would "be gain to Christ, and the object of his earnest desire was the returning of Christ, which would be connected with his own resurrection. To prove this you have two arguments.

1. Paul declares "Christ will be magnified by my death." But this is no proof of the point assumed, for as you *quote* him, he does not declare that Christ would be *more* magnified by his death, than by his life, which you quote him to prove.

2. But you do not quote him accurately. Paul does not say what you declare he does.

His words are, "Christ shall be magnified in my *body* whether by LIFE or DEATH." Here is not the least intimation that he would be more honored by his death than life, but only that, whether living or dying, Christ should be honored by him.

Your second argument is based upon the meaning of the original word rendered "*to depart*." This you render "*for the returning again*." To this I have and do now reply, by giving MacKnight's translation, "*to return, or return to port*." As if Paul had said, like one long tossed by tempest upon the ocean, I have a desire to "*return to port*."

In Luke 12: 36, you say it is applied to the return from a feast by which Christ illustrates his own return to this world.

Now were I to grant all you say, it would fail, manifestly, to sustain your position, for it is used in *Second Timothy*, 4: 6, in reference to the death of Paul, and *by Paul*, which establishes his use of the term in this sense.

"I am ready to be offered, and the time of my *departure* is at hand." Now, as it may be used in either case, the context must settle in reference to which it is used in a given case. Fas., means *immovable* and *rapid*, and its connection determines which. Now we come back to the connections.

I desire not to repeat what I have said, but to fix on the strong points.

1. He states what the results of living would be: "For me to live is Christ."

2. Dying "would be gain," to *him*, not to Christ, for Christ personally cannot be profited by us in any way, and as to the *cause* and *church* of Christ, to abide in the flesh was "more needful," for that: i. e. his life would serve that more than his death. Verse 24th.

3. Hence he did not know what choice to make, even were it left to him. "I have a desire to depart" —*to return to port*—to be with Christ, this is better. *What* is better? To depart, to be with Christ—to die. Not far better to have Christ return to judgment, as the following language shows. "Nevertheless, to abide in the *flesh*, is more needful for you." *To abide in the flesh*, stands opposed to *departing*, and being *with Christ*. Now it was not needful to *them*, the *church*, that Paul remain in the flesh after Christ returns.

Here was his conflict. He had, on his own account, "a desire to *die*, to *depart*," but his benevolent heart bound him to the church; for their sake he desired to remain, and he adds, "And having this confidence, I know I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith," i. e. knowing that it was necessary for the church that he remain, he knew he should not "depart," but "abide in the flesh," and "continue with them."

My dear sir, this is so plain, that a man who should seriously question it, would not surprise me, should he turn a universal doubter, and demand proofs of the existence of mathematical science, or of his own existence. I now dismiss these passages; I believe I have established *my* interpretation beyond *refutation*.

The conclusions follow: Paul desired to *die*; it was *gain* to *him*, because he would then be *with Christ*, and that is better than to *enjoy Christ* here. Gain it could not have been, if he became at death unconscious, and with Chrrst he is not, if yours is the true theory. As to the passages you quote, I have only to say, that after one more article, if you choose to present direct proofs, I will take the position of respondent.

I am as ever thy friend,
W. H. BREWSTER.

RESPONSE TO MR. BREWSTER.

DEAR SIR,—You say that "*Man has a spiritual as well as a material nature.*"

Your "first proof was, man is the *image* of Jehovah, his Creator."

Now let us look narrowly at this:

"God is a spirit."

But "*man* is of the earth, *earthy*."

Therefore man was *not* created in the "image" of God.

I state this syllogism upon what you have said in previous articles, "that the image of God, in which man was created, was not '*moral nature*.'"

Now, to reduce this point to the most tangible form, how many natures are there?

1. We have a *physical* or *animal* "*nature*;"
2. A *moral* "*nature*;" and
3. A *spiritual* "*nature*."

Now, you say man was not created in the *moral image of God;* and I say *he* was not created in the "*spiritual image of God*, because "God is spirit;" not a compound of *matter and spirit*, such as you

make man to be; but "spirit" only. And Paul informs us that the *nature* of "the first man was of the earth—earthy," and not spiritual, as you suppose. *Now, Sir, you and Paul are at variance!* You say man was created in the *spiritual image* of Jehovah; Paul says, No, "*the first man was of the earth—earthy!*"

I *press* this point upon your attention, and the attention of our readers.

2. You admit that man's "body could not be God's likeness, and as God was *wholly spiritual*, a being *wholly material* could not be in his image." And for the reason, that "a being *wholly material* could not be in his image," "a being" *partly* "material" could not.

3. My position is, that man was created in the *image, form, and likeness* of the Elohim, or Angels. That this image and likeness had no reference to "*nature*," *material*, nor *spiritual, but to* FORM AND CAPACITY. This view of the subject you certainly have failed to meet.

4. I admit that the "Everlasting Father" created all things; this I have never denied; but when this admission is made, you gain nothing in this controversy. The question is not whether the "Invisible God" created all things, or not; but whether He did this *personally*, or by the Elohim or Angels, as his agents. *This is the question.*

In the creation we observe the following things:

1. In the 1st chapter of Genesis, 1st verse, it reads, *Berayshith bara Elohim ayth*—In the beginning Elohim created. A singular verb is here coupled with a plural noun, which, according to collateral testimony, fitly enough implies *unity of purpose, with plurality of agents.* Also, the *power* by which these agents or Elohim acted, namely, *the Spirit of God.* Thus, in Job xxxiii. 4, "*The Spirit of God hath made me*, and the *Breath* of the Almighty hath given me life." Again, Job says: "*By his Spirit* he hath garnished the heavens." Now, as Dr. T. says, "the harmony of these passages is, that the Elohim made, and framed, and furnished the heavens and all the host of them BY THE SPIRIT."

2. Elohim said, "Let *us* make man in *our* image."

Elohim is plural, and, with the exception of the first verse, is always associated in this chapter with a plural verb. Why is this, if your hypothesis be true? God is not *many*, but *one*. "Though there be gods many and Lords many," says Paul, "yet to us there is but ONE GOD and Father of all; and one Lord Jesus Christ," &c.

There is one uncreated, self-existent God, who is above all; and there are subordinate messengers, Elohim, "gods," angels, or Holy Ones, "*who do his pleasure, hearkening unto the voice of His word.*" GOD NAMED HIS NAME UPON THEM; and hence what they execute, is ascribed to Him as the Great Architect.

3. There is a manifest distinction between "*Elohim*" and "*Jehovah Elohim*," as used in the history of the creation. The *Jehovah* Elohim is the LORD OF THE ELOHIM. This term is used throughout the second chapter, while that of *Elohim* is used in the first. In the third chapter this distinction is conspicuously presented. "Now, the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the *Lord God* (Jehovah Elohim) had made; and he said to the woman, Yea, hath God (*the Elohim*) said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" The "Jehovah Elohim" is the arch-Elohim, and, for aught I know, *at present*, may refer to the uncreated God, or to arch-Angels, according to the context.

4. After man sinned, the Lord God, Jehovah Elohim, "said, the man has become like one of us, *to know good from evil*," &c. The word "to know," in this passage, signifies *to experience good and evil;* this no man, who values his reputation as a critic, will deny. How, Mr. Brewster, can you explain this away? I hope, Sir, you will not slur over this point.

5. But, to return to the original point, you say, "All your (my) reasonings has granted my (your) conclusions," &c. Here you wax bold, and declare: "Here I hold you; you shall not evade it; you shall not escape from it." But, my dear sir, to what will you "hold me?" from what shall I not "escape?" and what shall I not "evade?" That "Jehovah is the creating *agent* brought to view in the first chapter of Genises?" If you "hold me" to this, you will hold me to an absurdity! If I "evade" it, I shall only "evade" a delusion! And if I "escape from it," I shall only "escape from" heresy! *And why?* Because *Jehovah* is not an "agent" at all, but *He employs "agents" to do His will!* An "agent" is one who acts for another; but God acts for Himself, and employs "agents" to do his will;" therefore, your "premises" are unsound, your "cords" are broken, and your cause lost, upon the assumption you have made.

6. The view presented in my last, in relation to "creation by delegation," as you are pleased to call it, are not "novel," except to Trinitarians, and those who believe there is "society in God." Keep calm, my dear sir; I suppose Dr. Thomas will compare with Dr. McNight in learning and biblical criticism; though I am not the special pleader of either.

7. You say, "creation by delegated power is a monstrous absurdity." Ah! indeed! From what portion of the Living Oracles did you learn this?

The affairs of the world, from the creation to the present time, have been committed to the Angels; and, consequently, in superintending the world, they exercise a "delegated power:" but this, according to your view, is an "absurdity," because the government of the world "implies the possession of omnipotence!" Now, I believe that the angel that rained fire and brimstone upon Sodom, &c., Gen. xix. 24, and the angel that slew all the "first born of Egypt," Exodus ix. 5, and the angel who destroyed 70,000 of Israel in one day, 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, and the angel that produced such an immense slaughter in the Assyrian camp, in one night,—I say I believe that these angels, if God were to command them, could, by the "power delegated" to them, create, or destroy, a world, "in six days." If God has "delegated power" enough to some men to *raise the dead*, is it unreasonable to suppose He could "delegate power" enough to an angel to *create a man?*

"He spoke, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast," are words which cannot be explained upon your hypothesis. "He spoke" to whom? Whom did "He command?" According to your view, "He spoke" to Himself! "He commanded" Himself! But the Bible teaches me, that "by the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them," &c. He gave the "*word*" and the Elohim "hearkened unto the voice of his *word*, and did his pleasure."

8. As to your favorite rule, "that the true meaning of a word may be substituted for that word," &c., I admit its correctness: but I apprehend *you* would not be willing to admit it in every case.

I will admit it in this case, and pledge myself to sustain the view by an appeal to the whole Bible.

9. "But you have no disposition to follow further this heathen notion, newly vamped by this learned Dr. which converts God into a recluse, and gives creation and providence to angels."

God is not "a recluse," according to my view of the subject. All that *is* done, is performed by Him, by means of his agents. The monarch on his throne is not "a recluse," because he governs his empire by his ministers; neither is Jehovah, because He rules the world by the Elohim.

The Bible clearly teaches, that a general and special "providence," is conducted by the ministration of angels.

10. When God says, that "*by himself* he spread out the heavens, and laid the foundation of the earth," He does not mean that He employed no agents; but that it was by His own *underived power* the work was done.

11. My good sir, you seem anxious for the victory; and hence you frequently exclaim, "my premises remain untouched, and my conclusion follows." But "let not him that putteth his armor on, boast as he that putteth it off."

Victory is but a poor reward for the labor and toil of contending for error. Truth, and not victory, is my object.

12. Again, you observe: "My whole argument on Phil. 1: 20, 21, &c., is passed with this declaration: 'I think you do not understand the passage.' And then you exclaim: "This is cool, certainly."

I hope my friend will keep his judgment "cool," and not suffer his feelings to prompt him to do injustice to an opponent. Now, what did I say? Here it is—"Paul *does not* say it would be 'gain to him,' personally, 'to die;" but the whole context shows that my exposition is correct—CHRIST AND HIS TRUTH WOULD BE MAGNIFIED. Paul was in a strait between choosing life or death, but there was a *third* thing, in relation to which he was in no strait; and that was '*the returning and being with Christ.*' You do not, I think, understand the passage." Now, *all* this is very different from the single sentence you quote. I hope you did not *intend* to misrepresent me.

13. Some time ago I gave an analysis of this passage, which you left "untouched," to use your phrase, until the present effort. I will now re-examine it.

At the 9th verse he commences: "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offense *till the day of Christ;* Being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God. But I would ye should understand, brethren, *that the things which happened to me have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel;* so that my bonds for Christ are manifest in all the *palace,*" (or Cesar's Court,) "and in all other places. And many of the brethren in the Lord, *becoming confident by my bonds, are* MUCH MORE BOLD *to speak the truth without fear.* Some indeed preach Christ from contention, not sincerely, *supposing to add affliction to my bonds.* But the other from love, *knowing that I am set for the defense of the gospel.* What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice; yes, and will rejoice. For I know that this will turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ. *According to my earnest expectation and hope,* that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, *Christ will be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.* But if I live in the flesh this is the fruit of my labor. Yet what I shall choose I know not. *For I am in a strait betwixt* two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better. Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." The reader is requested to peruse the whole chapter. Now, what are the governing statements in this quotation? They are these:

1. Paul prays that the Phillippians "may be sincere and without offense till *the day of Christ,*" which is his reign of a thousand years.

2. He tells them that all "the things which happened to him, had fallen out *rather to the furtherance* of the gospel," than its injury.

3. By this means, his "bonds for Christ are manifest in Cesar's Court, and all other places."

4. Some preached Christ, not sincerely, hoping thereby to superadd "affliction to his bonds."

5. Others preached him from love, knowing Paul was set for the *defense of the gospel.*

6. Paul's "*earnest expectation and hope*" was "that in nothing he should be ashamed, but with all boldness, *as always,* NOW ALSO, CHRIST WILL BE MAGNIFIED IN MY BODY, WHETHER BY LIFE OR BY DEATH."

7. He gives the reason for his last assertion,—"*For,*" or because, "to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

Here, then, we have the *text* and *context* fully before us; and I put the question, Does the context sustain your interpretation? So far from it, the words which I have emphasized are directly in opposition to it.

Paul points the Philippians to "*the day of Christ,*" as the time of their reward:" and do you suppose he expected his reward before them? His address to Timothy proves that he did not. Again, he says that all his afflictions, bonds, and imprisonments, had *furthered* the gospel, instead of retarding its progress. He is not discussing his own fate, excepting so far as Christ and his gospel were involved in the matter. And in reference to this, he makes one bold and unmistakeable declaration, that "*Christ will be magnified* IN MY BODY, *whether by life or by death,*" it mattered not—THIS *would be the effect?* Having driven the nail, he clenches it by answering, "For me to live is CHRIST."—it will redound to *his* glory, for "I am set for the *defense* of the gospel;" "and to die," in such a cause, and for Christ's sake, "*is gain;*" not to me, Paul, but to Christ; for if this were not so, how could "Christ be magnified in *my body by death?*"

"But," says he, "if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour; *yet what I shall choose I know not.*" Why did he not know what to choose? "For," or because, "I am in a strait betwixt *two.*" What "*two*" things were these, between which he was in a strait? You will doubtless say *life and death.* Then, according to this view, he did not

know which to "choose," life or death. Very well; while in this strait, not knowing whether to choose life or death, *what* CHOICE *did he express?* To what truth did he look? What *choice* did he make, which created an *earnest desire*? Was it life? No! Was it death? No! What was it then? IT WAS THE RETURNING AND BEING WITH CHRIST. "*Which*," he says, "*is far better.*" Better than what? Did he mean to say that life was better than death? No. Did he say that death was better than life? No. For, between *these*, he did not know which to choose. *It was the returning and being with Christ*, which was *far better. Better than life or death.* Now, Sir, I hold you here, and press home this exposition. Do not evade it, but look it fully in the face. I am willing to rest this controversy upon the correctness of this exigesis.

14. You make me to say that Christ would be "*more* glorified" by Paul's death, than by his life. Now, I have no where said this, nor have I even hinted it. My view *was*, and *is*, that Christ would be magnified by *both*. You state the very view I presented, and then, strange to tell, claim it for your own, and put me on the opposite side!

15. You claim "points" where I can see none, and where, I think, it will puzzle your readers to find any. No "point" is gained by you, so long as you fail to give the proper interpretation of the passage in question, and the exposition I have presented in this reply, in my estimation, puts that question to rest.

You again refer to McNight's translation—"*to return, or to return to port.*" If I were to admit this rendering, I should lose nothing by it; for I suppose no man will call the grave "a port." The "port" of the Christian is not the grave, but the new heavens and earth, which he enters by a resurrection from the dead.

You seem willing to admit the force of Luke 12: 36, but refer me to 2 Timothy 4: 6. In this place Paul says: "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my *analuseos*—DISSOLUTION is at hand." Paul expected no crown until "that day" when the Lord should come and raise him from the dead. *Analusai* and *analusis*, though derived from the same root, are not used by the sacred writers in exactly the same sense. The primary meaning of *analuseos*, which is the word used by Paul to Timothy, is *dissolution*.

16. There are a few more remarks I should like notice, but as this article is now quite long, and and the remarks themselves not very important, I will let them pass.

You promise, after one more article, to take up the passages presented in my last. When you have disposed of them, I will present you with others.

Yours very respectfully,
J. T. WALSH.

THE ANTE-DILUVIAN EARTH.

In an article on "The Ages," the question of the universality of the flood was discussed. In that article we argued that no rain fell before the deluge; but that the earth, in this respect was like Egypt, which was watered by the Nile.

1. In addition to the ideas presented in that paper, in relation to the ante-diluvian world or earth, we now present the following: After the waters of the flood had abated, Noah built an altar, and God promised him—"While the earth remaineth," or, as it literally reads from the Hebrew, "While as yet all the days of the earth remaineth, *seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.*" Genesis viii: 22.

We do not suppose for a moment, but that "day and night" obtained before the flood; but, from considerations soon to be offered, it is evident *they were of equal length.* But there is much reason to doubt the existence of "cold and heat," and "summer and winter." "Day and night" are spoken of before the flood, but, so far as known to me, "cold and heat," and "summer and winter" are not mentioned.

2. If "cold and heat" and "summer and winter" did not obtain before the flood, *then the* POSITION of the earth was changed at the time of the deluge. The axis of the earth—the globe—is *now* inclined to the ecliptic 66½ degrees; consequently it declines 23½ from a perpendicular position to the plane of the ecliptic, or to the plane of its own orbit. This produces the following results:

1. Inequality in length of day and night.
2. Heat and cold, summer and winter.
3. Inequality in the exhalations, in rain and drought.
4. Inequality in fertility of soil.
5. Those inequalities subject man to *varied* sickness, break down the human constitution, and cut short human life.
6. These inequalities confine many important productions of the globe within very narrow zones, and hence gives rise to commerce and *rival* interests, the fruitful causes of *war.*

These things obtain *now*, by reason of the *altered position* of the globe; but such, we have reason to believe, was not the condition of the primeval earth.

3. If the axis of the earth were perpendicular to the plane of its own orbit round the sun, the following consequences would be *inevitable:*

1. Its north and south poles would be always enlightened.
2. The days and nights be equal the world over.
3. The cold of winter and the heat of summer, give place to *perpetual spring.*
4. Excessive rains and excessive drought give place to *cloudless days and dewy nights.*
5. Hills and mountains, now covered with perpetual snow, and washed by the mountain floods, might become fruitful as the vales.
6. And thus would the globe become a *physical paradise!*

Such was, we believe, the condition of the primeval earth. Therefore, the health, vigor, and longevity of man—therefore, the plants and animals of all climates were then found in all the latitudes of human abode.

4. But the earth is "moved out of its place," and, therefore, instead of perpetual spring, we have the desolating influence of winter, the scorching rays of a summer's sun; perpetual snows cover our mountains, and the poles are locked up by eternal icebergs! We have storm and tempest, and hail, commingled with the howling tornado, the lightning's flash and the thunder's roar!

But the time is coming when God will "shake terribly the earth," set it upright, and *paradise restore!* We shall then not only have *physical*, but also a *moral* paradise. The earth will then yield

ts increase, the nations be blessed in Messiah, and the saints possess the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom, and the dominion under the whole heaven; and a universal shout of acclamation shall echo through the heavens, and resound from pole to pole.

J. T. WALSH.

DR. LEES' "SUGGESTION."

1. This estimable and learned friend has suggested the question, Whether I do not "*stretch* the fact of the connection of matter and mind too far."

2. In reply to this "suggestion," I submit the following considerations:

The Dr. admits a "*correspondence of vigor*, between the *bodily* and *mental* functions, *to some extent*. This "fact" bears upon the question *remotely*, and was never intended to do more, at least not by me. But, he asks the question, "Does it logically follow *on this account* that the mental change *is dependent* on the organic state?" I answer, "the mental change *is dependent* on the organic state" *of the brain*, but not upon this *only;* for the mind is affected by whatever influences the nervous system, or any part of it: nay, it does not stop there, but *any* external influence, such as the winds, the state of the atmosphere, and a thousand other things, affect the mind of man.

3. It is true that "our bodies afford a clear example of *synchronous progress* without *causative dependence*," as in the examples the Dr. has given; but it is also true that "our bodies afford" many examples "of *synchronous progress*" WITH "*causative dependence.*" And although "the legs do not increase in bulk *because* the arms expand, nor the head grow *because* the limbs enlarge;" yet the *mind* DOES "expand" "*because*" the brain is progressing towards maturity! Here we have "*synchronous progress*" with "*causative dependence.*" The fact is "the legs" gain *strength* as they enlarge, and so does the brain, *if healthy.* Ah! *if healthy!* But if it *is not healthy*, then the mind is idiotic, the intellect blank, and all the senses dull. Here we have "synchronous" *decay* with "causative dependence."

4. But "all our organs and tissues," *do not* "develope and decay in the same periods." "Organs and tissues," and different *systems* of "organs and tissues," "develope and decay" at different periods of life. The brain does not come to maturity so early as many other parts of the human economy; neither are the *organs of the brain* developed at one and the same time. In some the *nervous system* predominates, in others the lymphatic, in others the bilious, and in others the sanguine. And all these can be changed or modified. They all modify the mental functions, and these functions are modified or changed "*synchronously*" with the change of system or temperament.

5. The Dr. says—"As to the class of facts which manifest a modification (or suspension) of the *mental functions*, when the integrity of the *corporeal structure* of the brain has been disturbed (by accident or disease.) Does this relation entitle us to say, that the mind has an *absolute dependence* upon *structure*, that it cannot exist when the fabric is destroyed?"

I answer, *it does!* The brain is not an exception to all the other parts of man. Destroy the "corporeal structure" of the eye, and there is no sight; destroy the "corporeal structure" of the auditory apparatus, and there is no sound; "destroy" the *motor nerves*, and there is no action; "destroy" the nerves of sense, and there is no feeling; and "destroy" the *brain, and there is no mind!*

6. Man, nor the *mind* of man, is not like a watch, the motion of which can be suspended by a "tooth-pick." Disease is not a "*foreign substance*," but a *state* or condition—an *excess* or *deficiency* of *temperature;*—a too slow or too rapid atomic motion, in any given part, the brain for example.

Every "organ," "tissue," muscle, nerve;—every part of the body has its peculiar function. Destroy the "integrity of" its "corporeal structure," and you inevitably destroy its *function.* There is no exception to this rule!

Every thing depends upon organization! This is true of the "limbs," the arteries, the veins, the heart, the lungs, the liver, the spinal column, the spinal marrow, the *brain!* Destroy the "corporeal structure" of these organs, and where are their *functions?* Nowhere! No organization, no life; no life, no mind. As to Swedenborg's "spiritual organization," in reference to *mortal man*, it is an unmixed assumption. *Angels* may be spiritually organized for aught I know, but *men* are "of the earth—*earthy.*" In conclusion, I will say this is no "fallacy," but a "demonstration." A position I feel prepared to sustain in the face of the world.

Upon this question I claim *originality*, and invite discussion; for I have never been able to elaborate it fully, but hope to do so before many years, and to spread it before the public.

J. T. WALSH.

MORAL DEPRAVITY—ORIGINAL SIN.

These subjects have caused a world of controversy, and are destined to be examined still more. We have determined to devote a little space to them, assured that it is of much importance to understand what our corruptions are—what are their nature—how we came by them—and what is the remedy.

The doctrine of the depravity of man's nature by Adam's transgression, in one sense, is true; in another, we think, it is false. "By the offence of one—Adam—judgment came upon all men to condemnation," *to death*—or, a physical corruption. As to a moral corruption, or depravity, that is quite another matter; and before we settle down into the belief that Adam entailed on his posterity a morally depraved nature, or constitution, we ought to have at least one plain text of Scripture in support of that view. The popular theory of man's natural, or inherent depravity, is expressed by the "ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES" in their "*Larger Catechism*," as follows:—

"The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is *utterly indisposed, disabled*, and made *opposite* unto all that is spiritually good, and *wholly* inclined to *all evil*, and that *continually*, which is commonly called *Original Sin*, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions."

If this is the doctrine of the Scriptures, we have a right to expect it will be as plainly stated by the

authority of God as it is in the Catechism by the authority of men.

"The word of the Lord came unto" Ezekiel "saying—What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? *As* I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have *occasion* any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezek. 18: 1—4. Here moral depravity is spoken of; but, in a very different manner from the Assembly's Catechism. God here affirms with all the solemnity of the most sacred oath—"*as I live*"—that he would not allow men to attribute the propensity to sin to something done by their fathers. The identical "*proverb*" used by the Assembly of Divines, and which passes for sound theology by those who claim that they are the orthodox, is here most emphatically condemned by the authority of Jehovah.

Our Saviour is equally explicit as to the cause of the moral depravity of men. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, BECAUSE *their* DEEDS *were evil;*" not because they inherit a morally depraved nature. John 3: 19.

We shall now proceed to examine some of the PRINCIPAL TEXTS urged in support of the common theory.

GEN. 5: 3. "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat *a son* in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth." On this text Dr. Benson says—"Not only a *man* like himself—but A SINNER *like himself.*" A strange assumption this! We pray—Where is the proof? Oh, "Adam had lost the image of God, and so now begat a son in *his own image.*" Again, we ask—Where the proof is to be found that Adam had lost the image of God? Why—"He had sinned before his children were born, and thereby lost it." Still, you give us nothing but assumption. It is for you to settle first, what was the image of God in which man was made. We shall not stop now to settle it for you—but whatever it was, we affirm man did not lose it by Adam's sin; nor is there a single intimation of that character in all the Bible, but the reverse. This fifth chap. of Gen. begins with "the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him." Then without any intimation that Adam had lost the likeness or image of God, it proceeds to say, Adam begat a son in his own likeness, [not in the likeness of a devil, but the likeness in which he himself was created,] after his image." As no intimation of any change in Adam's image is recorded, since God created him, we have a right to conclude he begat a son in the likeness and image of his own creation, *viz.*—The likeness and image of God.

After the flood the Lord thus speaks, Gen. 9: 6, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." Why is man prohibited shedding his brother's blood? BECAUSE—"In the IMAGE OF GOD made he man." Certainly, that expression applies to all men, and not to Adam only, else it would be of no force. Here then we have demonstration that men possessed and were made in the image of God *after* the flood.

Again, Paul says, 1 Corth. 11: 7, "For a man ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the IMAGE and glory of God." And James says, chap. 3: 9, "Men *are* made after the *similitude* of God." Out of the mouth of three such witnesses, we conceive, the truth is established that the image and likeness of God, in which man was created, was not lost by the transgression of Adam. Do not accuse us of saying that Adam did not become a sinner by eating the forbidden fruit. We only affirm, he did not lose the image and likeness of God in which he was created. It is for our opponents to prove, if they can, that that image and likeness was holiness: this we deny, and challenge the proof. [See our article on Adam's Holiness, in Examiner for February.]

This text, Gen. 5: 3, is a most unfortunate one for the *Original Sin* theorists. This Son which Adam begat was "*Seth.*" So far as we can judge, Seth was a good man: at any rate, not one word is said to his discredit. If Moses had designed to teach the doctrine of inherent moral depravity it seems as though he would have given us Cain as the son begotten in the likeness and image of Adam. But, even then, there would have been *two* against *one;* for Abel and Seth being unblamable, so far as known, would have outweighed Cain's perverseness, and proved that Adam must have had a preponderance to the image of God, if that was *goodness.*

In the light of the texts noted, we leave our readers to judge if there is any ground for the statement in the Assembly's Catechism; or any cloak for men to cover up their own indolence in resisting and overcoming every temptation to sin.

The doctrine that a morally depraved nature is communicated by Adam to his posterity, in our opinion, is a most mischievous notion—forming a cloak for all kinds of sin and sinners. Satisfy a man that he is born, or, which is the same thing, *created* with a nature "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all spiritual good, and wholly inclined to all evil," &c., and he must be an idiot to come to any other conclusion than that he sins from necessity, and therefore is not blame worthy. Hence all classes of sinners, where the doctrine of inherent moral depravity is embraced for truth, do hide themselves under it as a cloak for their sins, as an excuse for the sins of their offspring. Parents instead of governing themselves and their children, find an excuse for their neglect by saying, "Poor things—old Adam corrupted them—they have a depraved nature—what can we do till God changes their hearts," &c. Their children are told that the doctrine of an inherent moral depravity is true; and thus are effectually discouraged from all efforts to serve God, and they cannot but regard Him as a hard master, and unworthy of their love.

We warn all to beware how they impeach the oath of God, by affirming that children's teeth are set on edge by their fathers' sin; and we warn them against flattering themselves that there is any excuse for their living in sin a single day. Our sins are our own; as such we shall have to answer for them. Unless repented of—forsaken, forgiven, and our affections and lives reformed, we shall cry in vain "Lord, Lord open unto us." If we are not mistaken, the position of the Assembly of Divines, and all who follow them in it, is a most unwarrantable *assumption*—unauthorized by the Bible—plainly contradicted by that book—and most corrupting in its tendency; though there may

be sincerity in its advocates, and they may really think they honor God; we impeach not their piety, but, to us, it is apparent they are in error.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—1 *John* 5: 12.

TOUR TO NEW ENGLAND.—We expect to spend two or three Sabbaths in Boston, *viz:* April first, eighth, and, perhaps, the fifteenth. We shall be glad to see friends there from the vicinity around, and may visit, for a day or two, other places. Our preaching in Boston will be in Chapman Hall, Chapman Place. We may be found at other times by inquiry at the store of Dickinson & Co., No. 26 Dock Square. We shall have a supply of the Six Sermons, bound and in paper covers: also, the Bible Examiner for 1848, bound and unbound; "Walsh's Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation," &c., and "*Dobney on Future Punishment.*"

DR. J. T. WALSH, our associate editor, will preach at Commissioner's Hall, east side of Third St., below Green, each Lord's day morning and evening, during our absence from this city.

"DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT" is now ready for delivery. *Price* 75 cents bound, 50 cents in paper covers. The latter only can be sent by mail. One third discount will be made for cash, where six or more copies are ordered. A depot will be opened for the sale of the work in New York city, and notice given of the place soon as the arrangement is made. Orders directed to us, in Philadelphia, will be attended to and answered punctually in our absence. Please state definitely whether you wish the work bound or in paper covers, and by what conveyance they shall be sent you.

THE SIX SERMONS.—Near forty thousand copies of these Sermons have been circulated, in the United States, since they were first published in 1842. We publish them in two forms, *viz.:* Quarto, 16 pages—three pages of which are on the Intermediate State of the Dead: and 18mo. of about 120 pages, including nearly the same as the Quarto and some 20 pages additional matter; not essential however to the argument, though tending to elucidate it. We have determined to put the quarto edition so low that any one can scatter them who is disposed to do it. Hereafter we will furnish *forty copies* in that form for *one dollar*, current money, if sent us free of expense. They can be sent by mail, and are only newspaper postage. Or, for one dollar sent us as above, we will send 20 copies of the Sermons, Quarto, and the Bible Examiner for one year.

AS WE HOPED—TRUTH ADVANCING.

We expressed the hope, in the last Examiner, that the Methodist Preacher, who was the innocent occasion of the strictures of the True Wesleyan, would see his way clear fully to embrace and publicly to declare his faith in the Bible truth—"*No immortality out of Christ,*" &c. That hope has not been disappointed as the communication following will show. The note which called out the strictures of the Wesleyan, was the following, in the January number of the Examiner:—

"The doctrines you advocate are taking root more extensively than you may be aware of." We added—"So writes an eminent Methodist preacher to us, whose name, at present, we are not at liberty to give."

We take the liberty now to repeat, that we consider Br. Bates, who wrote the above, and who now comes out over his own signature in the following letter, an "eminent Methodist preacher." He long had a reputable standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, as one of her best ministers, and filled some of her most important stations. He is now one of the first ministers in the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America; and at this time ministering to one of the most important congregations in that connection. We consider him "eminent" in candor, in honesty, in piety, and in courage; fearlessly following the convictions of his own mind after patient and faithful investigation; such a man, through the grace of God upon him, is an honor to the Wesleyan Connection, and would be equally so to any other body of christian men with whom he might associate. We sincerely hope the Wesleyan Connection will not force him from among them, but manifest that spirit of toleration and free discussion, the denial of which, by the M. E. Church, brought them into their present organization. We take this opportunity to advise all ministers and private members to remain in the organization with which they are associated, so long as they can enjoy liberty of conscience and expression: let the sin be theirs if they force you from among them to seek church communion elsewhere. Do not voluntarily remove the leaven of truth God has entrusted you with, from among those where your lot, in his providence, has fallen; but if they reject it and cast you out of their synagogue, you will be clear, and will have honored God by your patient endurance of reproach for his truth and name's sake.

LOWELL, Mass., March 3d, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—I thank you for your kind article in the last number of the Examiner, headed, "THE TRUE WESLEYAN." I have written to Br. Lee, avowing myself the writer of the brief sen-

tence which called forth his strictures; stating to him frankly the position I occupy, and authorizing him to publish the communication, if he thinks it best to do so. I am an earnest seeker of truth, and as far as I see my way clear, I speak boldly, both in private and public. I am a full believer in the personal reign of Christ on *this* earth; the return of the remnant of Israel and Judah to the land of their fathers; and a state of probation after the advent. On these, and kindred topics, I delivered a course of eight sermons, to my congregation in this city, last summer. On the great questions of "*life* and *death*," I am perhaps not quite so fully settled. There are some difficulties in respect to the state of the dead; though, to my mind, the preponderance of evidence is in favor of their unconsciousness. I can scarcely be said to have a doubt that the wicked will utterly perish, in the most literal sense of the expression. On points of so much importance, however, I wish to proceed with great deliberation and caution. I shall maintain what I fully believe to be true, *at any expense;* endeavoring to use Christian prudence as to time and manner.

You are at full liberty to give my name, as the writer of the remark noticed in the True Wesleyan, if you think best. I simply stated what I know to be a *fact*.

Affectionately,
M. Bates.

Since the foregoing was received from Br. Bates, we have received an order for the Examiner for '48 and '49, and a copy of the Six Sermons, from a distant place, with this announcement.

"I am a Wesleyan Methodist Minister, and am seeking for truth in relation to the destiny of the wicked. I am perplexed with the doctrine of endless torment. I wish to 'prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.'"

We praise the Lord that the spirit of inquiry has gone forth, and pray that He may direct it in such manner that his name shall be honored. We have much hope for Wesleyan Methodists. The independent spirit they possessed broke them off from the trammels of Episcopacy; and we trust they will not suffer themselves to be enslaved by dogmas which ignorance and superstition have cast over the glorious character of the God of Truth and Love.

LETTER FROM A. C. HAND.

The writer of the following communication, we believe, is a minister in the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection:"

Br. Storrs:—In the August number of the Examiner you remark, in reply to a letter from Br. P. M. Way, that—"*The root of the whole subject lies in this one question,*" "*Is man immortal by creation or generation?*" Now, either my mental vision is exceedingly obscure, or the above quoted question does not contain the gist of the subject. For either—1st. The soul may be immortal, not by creation or generation, but by the will of God, expressed or implied: or, 2d. Admitting that the soul is not immortal by creation or generation, still it may be conscious during the interim between death and the resurrection, and after the judgment either suffer torment ad infinitum, agreeably to the orthodox theory, or, according to yours, cease to exist by submersion in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. I think you will admit that the same doom awaits angels, which kept not their first estate, and finally impenitent men. If so, and the former are awaiting in vivid consciousness their fearful destiny, why may not the latter, whether that destiny be endless torment or extinction of being? The question as to man's final destiny does not, necessarily, absorb the question, according to the best light I have received, whether he is conscious during the interim between probation and judgment. If man can be shown to be the soulless being represented by that philosophy which resolves the soul into a mere principle of life, or the action of the positive and negative electro-magnetic forces upon the brain, thus evolving mental phenomena, and which, when the body returns to dust, vanishes into an airy nothing, and can be found nowhere, why then the whole question is settled. To convince thinking, reasoning, candid men, that man is such a being, will require unsophisticated argument, based on stern, unyielding matters of fact, and the explicit testimony of Revelation.

While many disgusting relics of papal misrule and superstition are clearly seen lingering in Protestant Christendom, may we not, at the same time, perceive that poor human nature, cut loose from the restraints of sectarian bigotry and denominational attachments, is strangely prone to run wild in its career of unshackled inquiry and free investigation? and, verging to the opposite extreme, trench upon the grounds of skepticism? No sooner is the frail barque cut loose from Scylla, than she dashes under full canvass toward Charybdis. What a mercy if shipwreck of faith is not the fatal consequence! If we venture out on a voyage of discovery in unknown seas, we shall do well to take with us the *Heavenly Pilot*, and be sure to *keep close to the record.*

The questions you are discussing are not of trifling importance. The conclusions to which you have arrived, *if true*, will not merely *modify*, they will *revolutionize* the theology of the age. If not true, the sooner they are scanned and exploded the better for the peace and safety of all concerned. My earnest prayer is, that truth may be elicited, and error exposed and exploded, whatever may become of antiquated systems of theology and ecclesiastical establishments.

Affectionately yours for Truth and Purity,
A. C. Hand.

Keeseville, N. Y., Nov. 21st, 1848.

Reply to Br. Hand.

We still think that "*the* root" of the whole subject lies in the question—"Is man immortal by creation?" That he was not thus immortal, the threatening of *death*, by his Creator, makes certain; and if it needed any confirmation, we have the testimony of God himself that it was his will that man, in sin, should not be immortal, by His saying—"Lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever"—*i. e.* be immortal in sin. Thus man was not immortal by creation, nor "by the will of God, expressed or

implied," but exactly the reverse in both respects. That the doom of the wicked is death—to "be as though they had not been"—we fully believe, because the Bible explicitly declares it; and not a solitary text of inspiration affirms immortality or endless being of wicked men. Die they will—*literally—truly*—an awful *reality:* a death without recovery; and from which there is no redemption; and therefore their punishment is eternal; but, it is "eternal *destruction*," and not *preservation* in misery.

The fact that sinning angels are "in vivid consciousness," is no proof that *dead* MEN are conscious. Angels, so far as we know, have never yet undergone a *disorganization.* Will it be pretended that *dead men* have undergone *no* disorganization!! If not, they need no resurrection, and Swedenborgianism is true.

Man *is* "soulless" in the popular definition of the term soul—that is—he has no *immortal* soul by creation or generation; nor by the will of God, except in, through, and by Jesus Christ; and that only attained by the resurrection; and he is to "*seek for*" it by a "patient continuance in well doing:" see Rom. 2: 7. "To convince, thinking, reasoning, candid men," that the Scriptures teach the immortal soul theory, much longer, "will require unsophisticated argument," such as immortal-soulists have never yet been able to produce. That "Diana" of self-styled orthodoxy will need something more than the plea of *age:* that plea, we grant, it can bring; for, the first and only text in the Bible that asserts the doctrine is in the 3d chap. of Gen., 4th verse, "Ye shall not surely die"—*you are immortal.* If that witness is true, we give our opponents the "argument." We leave them to decide whether they are content to abide the decision of their *principal* witness, if not their only one.

Br. H. cannot be more keenly alive to the dangers of "a voyage of discovery" than we are; nor of the importance of the "*Heavenly Pilot*," and keeping "*close to the record.*" We dare say, we have had all the fears on these subjects that he ever had, and just as many more as the mariner in such a voyage may be supposed to be more alive to his situation than a man who sleeps quietly at home, content that others should do the exploring for him rather than hazard the perils of the sea himself.

We think we fully understand that "the questions" we "are discussing are not of trifling importance;" and also, that they "will not merely *modify* the theology of the age," but "*revolutionize*" it. The theology of the age needs revolutionizing; it grew out of the despotisms of the past centuries, when men were kept in awe by terror and force, and despots found it necessary to convert their God into a Devil, like themselves, lest the people should throw off their government. But despots and savage rulers are falling; and with them will fall the savageness that has been so long and so wrongfully attributed to the *God of love.* The day has opened when every man's work, which he hath builded on the Christian foundation, is to be tried by fire of what sort it is; and the *fire of discussion* will try it. Many will suffer loss, even the loss of all their labor in building with wood, hay, and stubble—doctrines which are not of God, and therefore cannot stand. They tremble to see their long labor and fine spun theories in danger of falling, and being proved of no value. But we may all be thankful if we do not lose ourselves with our works, as we shall if we are ashamed of Christ and *his words,* and are unwilling to bear the reproach of advancing in truth because unpopular. "How can ye believe who receive honor one of another?" Many who suffer loss, because their work will not bear the fire which is to try it, yet, having been sincere, will be saved, though so as by fire. Please read 1 Cor. 3: 11—15.

FUTURE STATES.

By Rev. Reginald Courtenay, A. M.

(Continued from page 39.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

It is now to be inquired whether the Books of the New Testament, which contain the Gospel that brought life and immortality to light, remove aught of the gloom with which, as we have seen, the earlier Scriptures enveloped the grave; and disclose to us any brightening of the realms of Hades through the death or resurrection of Christ?

In the New Testament, even more frequently than in the Old, the state of the departed is termed "sleep." For the disciples of Christ, strong in their hope of immortality, dwelt more on the future restoration to life, than on the intermediate gloom: which they described by a word not *necessarily* implying a return to consciousness, but perfectly consistent with it, and when coupled with express promises of resurrection, calculated to lead men to look forward without dread to their departure into the unseen world. Thus St. Paul says of the unworthy partakers of the Holy Communion, "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep;" and bids the Thessalonians "sorrow not concerning them which are asleep in Jesus." And thus our Lord himself said of the daughter of Jarius. "The maid is not dead but sleepeth," *merely* to signify that she would be restored again to life. Merely for this end; since, when His disciples misunderstood His saying, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth," "then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead."

It has been often supposed that the *soul* is altogether free from the dominion of this "sleep," and that the word is employed in Scripture in order to denote the rest of the body in the grave, and to remind us that that rest will be temporary only. But does the word sleep, in its *usual* acceptation, refer solely or chiefly to the body? Most certainly not. It is usually understood to mean a state of unconsciousness, either total or partial. In ordinary language a man is said to be awake, whenever he is *conscious* of what is going on around him, or is exercising any control over the current of his own thoughts, though he may be lying motionless and with closed eyes, in the usual posture of sleeping persons. And to walk "in one's sleep" is to walk in a state of *unconsciousness.* Both these instances prove that the word is commonly used of the mind, and the mind alone. Similarly, a limb is said to be "asleep" when it is benumbed, insensible, unconscious, *dead*;* and further, if sleep did not de-

* In sleep, unaccompanied by dreaming, consciousness does not exist; at least there is not the slightest proof of its existence. We are therefore justified in asserting that real sleep is a temporary metaphysical death.—*Macnish on the Philosophy of Sleep.*

denote insensibility but repose, we should find it frequently used to signify the rest of inanimate things. But how is it that when a forest is felled, or a city has fallen into ruins, the trees or stones are never said to be sleeping? Plainly because they are not in a state of suspended consciousness; they were never awake. And why is it that a tree, when erect, living and growing, cannot even be conceived to sleep or wake? Simply because it has no *consciousness* which can come or go. The word "sleep" does not necessarily denote a state which shall be followed by restoration to life or consciousness. It was not so used when God said of the Babylonish idolators, "they shall sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake," nor by the Epicurean philospher, who termed death "a long unbroken never ending sleep." It must be kept in mind that the question here is not whether the body of a man can in any intelligible sense be said to be asleep, but whether, when *the man* is said to be asleep, his mind is not supposed to be wrapped in slumber.

Much stress has been laid upon the fact that the Greek word *koimasthai*, which is used to express the sleeping the sleep of death, literally signifies *to recline;* and seems therefore to refer to a state rather of the body than of the mind. But it is not so understood by St. Matthew, when in his account of our Lord's Crucifixion he wrote "the graves were opened, and many bodies of the Saints which slept arose and came out of the graves, after his resurrection." For in the original the expression is literally "many bodies of the sleeping saints;" the word rendered "sleeping," (*kekoimematon*—recumbent, reclining) being that which it is sometimes pretended refers to the body alone.

Again, what is to "awake," but to be restored to life, consciousness and activity? And why should we confine to the body alone the meaning of such expressions as these, "All men shall rise again *with* their bodies," "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall wake and shall come forth," "when I wake up after thy likeness I shall be satisfied with it," "he shall rise again," "I will raise him up at the last day." And in what way can we best reconcile such expressions with the language of the Old Testament writers concerning the grave? Surely not in alleging that they relate only to the body. If the soul of a saint departed were already raised to glory, and exerting its energies in a much more perfect manner than before, that saint would not be said to be in a land of forgetfulness, merely because his soulless body was so. But we have seen that the grave was called a place of darkness and silence, a land of forgetfulness, a hiding place from God, a land in which there is no knowledge, and where all things are forgotten?

To these passages have been opposed others which, since they declare that the "life" once kindled within the souls of believers by the grace of God is "eternal," and that they *already have* this "eternal life," seem to imply that there can be no interval of unconsciousness. But when our blessed Lord would confirm to any one this promise of eternal life, he did so, as we find in many instances, by reminding and assuring them *of a resurrection.* Thus having declared, "he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is* passed from death unto life;" he thus confirms his words, "Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." The same connection is exhibited in a preceding passage—"As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." And again in the following chapter—"This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which believeth on the Son may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

And then, when the believer is thus raised up, he will rejoice in the presence of Christ: then, and *not before.* Yet to many persons St. Paul has appeared to say the contrary. "I am in a strait betwixt two," he says, "having a desire to *depart and to be with Christ,* which is far better. Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." And shortly before, "for me to live is Christ, and *to die is gain.*" And again, "we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord." But let St. Paul himself explain his own meaning. He thus continues the passage last quoted. "Wherefore we labor, that *whether present or absent,* we may be accepted of him. *For we must all appear before the judgement-seat of Christ,* that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." St. Paul then hoped to be accepted of Christ *whether absent from him in this world, or present with him in the world to come;*" and through this hope desired to depart; disregarding altogether his brief plunge into darkness, his "momentary hiding in the grave." The whole context also shows this to have been his feeling. He daily hazarded his life, in confident hope of the time when he himself, and all his disciples, being together raised from their graves, should be admitted into the presence of God and of Christ.—"Knowing that he which raised up Jesus from the dead, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall *present us, with you.*" *Parastesai* properly signifies to "introduce," or "present," (i. e. before the Father's throne,) and is again used by St. Paul in another epistle, in exactly the same signification. Christ gave himself for his Church, he says, "that he might present it unto himself a glorious Church;" and this surely at the Last Day, when the bride shall be brought unto the King; and with joy and gladness enter into his palace.* This *presentation* of all the redeemed together, and especially of his own disciples, unto Christ at his second coming was the reward, the "weight of Glory," for which St. Paul laboured. "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing," said he to his Thessalonian converts, "Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ *at his coming*?" And he looked, he said, "for invisible things, which also were *eternal.*" "For we know," he continues, "that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands,

* Psalm xlv. We have additional proof that St. Paul hoped to be "present with Christ" at the Last Day, in 1 Cor. i. 7–9. Where he exhorts them to wait for Christ's coming, who should "confirm them to the end, that they might be *blameless* in that day;" and might be fit to form part of the church which should then be found "without spot or wrinkle."

eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burthened, *not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Here St. Paul expressly declared, that he *desired not* an intermediate happiness for his soul alone, but to be clothed in a glorified body, in which he should find acceptance when presented to Christ. When therefore he immediately afterwards, almost in the same breath, expresses his wish to "depart and be with Christ," we cannot doubt that the object of his hope was an entrance, at the Last Day, into eternal glory.*

Indeed throughout the apostolical epistles, and in more places than can be referred to in these pages, the interval between this life and the next, between this world and the world to come, is passed over as if it were nothing. *Nothing, even in comparison of this present world.* The Christian is not taught to look forward to it, even as a period of repose from the miseries of this life! When Christians suffered persecution, what could be more natural—if there were indeed a conscious repose in the grave,—than to remind them of it; to remind them that, though they could not at once receive their final reward, yet a partial relief, an intermediate reward, should instantly be given to their disembodied souls? But when St. Paul would give encouragement to the Thessalonians under a heavy persecution, he promises them *no rest whatever* until Christ's second coming. "It is a righteous thing for God to recompense tribulation to them which trouble you, and to you who are troubled *rest with us,—when* the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with the angels of his might."† The "rest" here spoken of,—in the original *anesis*,—is simply *a cessation of trouble;* precisely that kind of repose which, according to many (uninspired) persons, the grave itself is calculated to afford.

There remaineth indeed "a rest for the people of God;" a rest not in the narrow house, in the chambers of the grave; but in the heavenly Canaan, the new Jerusalem, the prepared mansions: a rest from labors reserved for the blessed dead who have died in the Lord, *from that time forth*, when the Apocalyptic Babylon has fallen, and the ripened harvest of the earth is cut down by the sickle of Almighty wrath.

Until the Lord shall be revealed from heaven, his saints are to look for nothing at his hands but that he should keep them secret, intending at his set time to remember them, and that "their spirits and souls *and bodies*, should be preserved," before God, unto that day. Thus it was that Stephen prayed, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit;" even as Jesus himself, when expiring on the cross, voluntarily resigned his spirit to his Father's keeping, to be restored to him again on the third day. Thus St. Paul's consolation, in the prospect of death was, "if we be dead with him, we *shall* also live with him; if we suffer with him, we *shall* also reign with him." He hoped not to reign, neither did he hope to *live*, before the appearing and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He looked to receive a crown of righteousness, which the judge should give him *in that day;* and sought no other reward.

Many of his expressions also tend to show that *life itself*, as well as reward, was to be future.

"As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly;" bear it, according to St. John, when Christ shall appear, and we shall "see him as he is;" all which is in perfect accordance with those expressions of our Lord above referred to, wherein the gift of "eternal life," or immortality, is connected with that of resurrection of the body. But nearly the whole of the remarkable chapter to which we have referred, deserves attentive consideration; inasmuch as the subject of resurrection is not there merely alluded to, but made the subject of a formal dissertation. "If Christ be not raised, they which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished*." If these words do not amount to a proof of intermediate unsciousness, they at least show, that but for the resurrection of Christ the grave *would have been* the destruction of all who entered its dark portals;—that man is naturally mortal. But they may well be understood to declare the far more important doctrine, that all the departed *are* now slumbering in the unconsciousness of death, and can never be reanimated, unless Christ have indeed risen.

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." The force of these words can be evaded in no other way, than by maintaining that Christ gives life to the body only;—that it is not through *His* power that souls are saved alive. But if it be true, that Christ restores to the *soul* that life which was forfeited through Adam; and if St. Paul declares that it is *at Christ's coming* that the forfeited life is restored, then it is plain that the power of death prevails over the soul unto the Great Day. The latter part of this remarkable chapter strengthens this conclusion. For it allows to the first or natural man,—by whom is here intended the Christian, in that state in which he dies,—no portion whatever in, nor benefit from, the life which Christ is afterwards to bestow. "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." * * "As we have borne the image of the earthy, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly." It is not till the last trump has sounded, that we can hope to "put on incorruption." Will it be said that this refers only to our receiving in that day an imperishable body? What then can be meant by the further expression—"this mortal shall put on immortality?" How could the possessor of an immortal soul, which, whether embodied or not, would live in glory and bliss through all eternity, be called mortal until the resurrection? Observe that St. Paul is not here speaking of the body only, but of *the man*. He is replying to the two-fold question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? And it is not the body of the first man, but the FIRST MAN HIMSELF who is earthy, mortal, corruptible. His corruptible, mortal frame does not "put on immortality;" for "thou sowest not that body which shall be;" but it is exchanged for a body of a different kind. The man, or the soul

* The reader is most earnestly requested to peruse the latter part of 2 Cor. iv. and the former part of the chapter following.

† And similarly in 2 Cor. i. 9. "We had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in *God which raiseth the dead*." And Philip iii. "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."

of the man, is invested with immortality; it is the man therefore, or the soul of the man, which is previously mortal.

And the interval between the putting off the one body, and assuming the other, between the sowing of the seed, and the rising of the new creature, is passed over as if it were nothing.

The whole of this doctrine of intermediate unconsciousness derives strong support from the noted passage of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, wherein he beseeches them not to sorrow for the dead, even as the rest (the heathen) which have no *hope*. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For * * we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord shall descend from heaven; * * and the dead in Christ *shall rise first*. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; *and so shall we ever be with the Lord.* Wherefore comfort ye one another with these words." St. Paul here declares that the dead in Christ shall meet one another, and meet also their friends who were alive at Christ's coming, on the Last Day and not before. But it has been said, "the Thessalonians deeply regretted the loss of their friends: St. Paul assures them of the certainty of a re-union. They thought that the day of Christ was at hand: then, if so, St. Paul tells them that Jesus would bring with him their deceased friends; and, if they died previously, St. Paul does not deny that they would see him previously." The words "bring with him" might, it is true, lead us to some such view as this. But did St. Paul intend them to believe that their sleeping friends were actually with Jesus: that *they which were asleep would prevent* (*or anticipate*) *them which were awake!* This would be completely to destroy the force of his own statements made in order to prove that the converse of the proposition was untrue. He prevents the Thessalonians imagining that they who lived to see Christ's coming would be before-hand with those that were asleep, by assuring them—that *the dead would rise first*;—and that *all*, quick and dead, would be caught up *together*, and would, at one and the same time, meet their Lord.* "Think not, he says, that your friends departed are lost to you, lost to life and light, as the heathen think. They shall be blessed at the coming of Christ: yea, and be blessed as soon and as fully as yourselves. When you lift up your heads and behold your redemption drawing nigh, know that their redemption also is at hand. The trump of God shall call, and they shall answer; the voice of the archangel shall summon them from their graves: they shall not be forgotten, nor left behind, but gathered from the four winds by the angels of God, they shall take their places, first or last, in the joyful procession that goeth to meet the Bridegroom. Though the minds of all men naturally abhor death: though all would find much comfort (and inclination leads men to *take* comfort,) in believing that their departed friends have already, without resurrection, or ascension, entered into their glory: St. Paul attempted not to console the Thessalonians with *such* words. "When Christ cometh with clouds," he taught with St. John, then "every eye shall see him;"—then, and not before. "Him the heavens must receive until the restitution of all things," and into heaven the dead who die in the Lord have not as yet ascended. He is gone to prepare a place for them, and *when he cometh again* he will receive them to himself, that where he is, there may they be also. Their souls are now, with David's, left in Hades; there to continue till they put on incorruption: but "when Christ, who is their life, shall appear, *then* shall they also appear with him in glory."

The foregoing passages show that the apostles expected, and therefore we are to expect, *no* rest, *nor* glory, *no* vision of Christ, *nor* conformity to his image, *no* victory over death and the grave, till the blissful hour of resurrection. They prove, that between death and resurrection there is an interval, so unimportant in a Christian's eye, that it may be passed over as nothing. They show that whoever, in the spirit of St. Paul, desires to "depart and be with Christ," longs for liberation not from the burden only of the flesh, but from that dominion of mortality, which shall endure till the Last Day. They therefore prove, that if there be a state of intermediate consciousness, it certainly is not so desirable a state for the redeemed, as it is commonly represented to be; and they moreover contain nothing to contradict, but much to confirm the language of the Old Testament, which pronounces the dead to be in a land where all things are forgotten, where God's truth is not manifested, nor his righteousness known, nor His holy name praised: but where men are "hidden for a little moment," while they "know not any thing," but "all their thoughts have perished." Even by their omission of all mention of the intermediate state,—of the sojourn of the soul in Hades, in places where we should naturally expect them to speak of it, if it were indeed a state of life and consciousness, of hope or fear, joy or sorrow, they strongly confirm the testimony of the Jewish Scriptures; but in fact the New Testament is far from being *silent* on this point. It often expressly speaks of Hades,†—the place or state of the departed.

The first passages are those which relate to Capernaum,—and to the Church of Christ. "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to Hades." "On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." By the *gates* of Hades is intended the power of Hades,—in other words, the power of DESTRUCTION. It has indeed been asserted, that the gates of Hades signify the power of Satan; but since Hades is not interpreted to mean Satan, or the realm or dominion of Satan, in any other place in all the Bible, it ought not, as it need

* Similarly, in the next chapter, he says "Christ died for us, that *whether we wake or sleep*, we should live together with him. Wherefore comfort yourselves together.

† In the authorized English version correctly rendered Hell; from the Saxon "Helan," to cover; and therefore signifying an obscure, as Hades signifies an invisible place. The future place of punishment is in the original Greek, Gehenna, which word, unhappily, has not been retained in our version. Hence the prevalent notion that the flames of hell—Gehenna—are *now* burning beneath the earth, and that devils are now occupying it: and hence the more deplorable error of the vulgar, who often suppose that our blessed Lord descended into the place of torment. It were best to reject the word "hell" altogether, and substitute for it Hades or Gehenna.

not, to be so interpreted in this. Capernaum was not said to be exalted to heaven, because the city was admitted into God's kingdom above, but because she was then great and flourishing, and flushed with the "pride of life;" and she was to be brought down, not into Satan's realms, but to desolation and destruction. Satan already reigned over her; she needed not to be brought low, to fall into his hands; for he is not the Prince of the power of the grave, but the Prince of the power of the air; and if he be a Ruler of darkness, it is the darkness of *this* world. Unlike Capernaum, the Church of Christ, according to the prediction of its Founder, was never to be destroyed, but to stand firm alike against the assaults of Satan, and of unbelieving men.

On the supposition that Hades is a region of life, and not *necessarily* either evil or good, our Lord's promise to his church becomes without meaning. As well might it have been said, "the *power of resurrection* shall not prevail against the Church; inasmuch as resurrection implies a change of state, and is not *necessarily* either a good or an evil: or as well might our, Lord have said,—if Hades be a region of life—"My church shall never pass into a disembodied state." But His words plainly declare, "An evil and destroying power shall not prevail."

[To be continued.]

ADOPTION—STRICTURES.

By H. Grew.

Brother Storrs:—Among the excellent remarks found in the exposition of the first chapter to the Ephesians, there are some which appear to me to demand a candid review. The exposition maintains the Scripture truth that "holiness—is the property or characteristic of a spiritual nature;" also, that "in order to attain to the divine nature which is spiritual," the (i. e. man) must be born again—viz., of the Spirit. This necessarily implies that the spiritual birth is the *origin or efficient cause of all holiness in man.* It is God's own work, as the Spirit of Truth declares; they are born "*of God.*" "If any man is in Christ he is a new creature; old things have passed away, and all things are become new, and "*all the things are of God.*"

Now if this work of God is itself, as the Expositor admits, the *cause* of holiness, it cannot be performed by God on the ground of any previous holiness in man. It must be as the word itself declares, because he will have mercy on whom he will. If so, he may *purpose* to have mercy on whom he will. I refer now to the mercy of the spiritual birth. What objection then can the Expositor have to admitting a choice of such *persons* (whom God thus determines to renew) in Christ Jesus, before the foundation of the world, as the words of the fourth verse plainly imply? What objection to admitting the predestination of *persons* to this renewal? Is not this the proper import of the words in the fifth verse, "predestinated us unto the adoption of children?" Do we not become the *children of God* when *born of God*? We may as well object to the performance itself of that work of renewal which is the cause of all holiness in man, on a part only of the human family, (which I understand the Expositor to admit) as object to God's eternal purpose to perform it.

It is remarked that "no man can be a child of God by adoption till he puts on immortality." Whose children are, we then, after renewal by the Holy Spirit, until the trumpet shall sound? What is the proof of this novel sentiment, for we must "prove all things?" Two passages are given. Rom. 8: 23, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body.*" Not an iota of proof is here. The apostle does not say the adoption of *children*, and if he did the connection would prove that it referred to the adoption of the children of God to the possession of a peculiar privilege. But there is no reference in the passage to the manner in which, or the means by which *we become* the children of God, which the Scriptures so plainly teach in numerous passages, is by our being begotten and born of the Spirit of God, by faith in Christ Jesus, &c. &c.

The other passage adduced is Luke 20: 35, 36. They which shall be accounted worthy to attain that world and the resurrection from the dead, can die no more, and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection. The passage necessarily implies no more than that "They which shall be accounted worthy," &c., *are* the children of God, and are also the children of the resurrection. Ontes, from eimi, to be, does not mean *becouse.*

It is observed that the saints are children of God by *faith*—or anticipation," &c. Is this a fair interpretation of the words of inspiration, "*Ye are* all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus?" Did the apostle mean that they were *not* the children of God, but they should be at some future period? Is his proposition equivalent to saying, by faith you anticipate that in some future time you shall be the children of God? As well may we affirm that when he informed them that they were "justified by faith," he meant that they were still under condemnation and unpardoned, but might anticipate forgiveness at some future period!

1 John 5: 1, 2. These verses teach the palpable truth that all who are *now* born of God are *now* the children of God. John 1: 12, 13, proves the same. If these Scripture proofs are deemed insufficient, surely the following must settle the question, "Beloved now are we *the sons of God* and *it doth not yet appear what we shall be.*" Here the *present* and *future* are contrasted, and what we *now* are is positively declared.

Must not our friend have overlooked the scriptural testimony when he exclaimed, "What! a "corruptible man" *now* an adopted child of the incorruptible God?" If the believer in Jesus Christ, who is conformed to the holy image of his Saviour, by the renewal of the Spirit of God, was *nothing more* than a "*corruptible man*," there might be some propriety in such an exclamation. Against such an exclamation may we not use the following? "What!" a man "*begotten*" and "*born of God*," not a child of God. A man who has "received the spirit of adoption, whereby" he cries "Abba *Father*," not a *child* of God! A man who "dwelleth in love" and "in God and God in him," whose body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, not a child of God. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." Surely the Expositor must recede from such a position. If such are not the children of God, to what class do they pertain? Shall we denominate them, as Br. Campbell some years ago denominated unimmersed christians, "friendly aliens?" If we are not "the children of God" we are "the children of the devil:" See 1 John 3: 10 for proof. See also, Matt. 5: 9, John 11: 52, Rom. 9: 26, 1 John 5: 2. It is true indeed that although we are "*now* the

adopted sons" or children "of God," 1 John 3: 2, we have not attained to the perfect stature of men in Christ Jesus, neither shall we be perfected until "the adoption" into the perfect kingdom of God, by our resurrection from the dead. In the joyful expectation of this glory, let us now be "followers of God *as dear children*." HENRY GREW.

We let Br. Grew's strictures pass with a brief remark. He, at last, admits all we contended for, *viz.*, that to be children of God *by faith* is one thing, and to be so by a "*perfect*" *adoption* is another, and and a very different matter. When we *believe*, we become children of God *by faith:* but suppose we were never to be "adopted into the *perfect* kingdom of God, by a resurrection from the dead?" Then surely, we never would be God's *adopted* children in that *peculiar* sense in which we used the phrase, because not partakers of his immortality, incorruptibility, endless life. An apostle has said—"We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our faith steadfast unto the end:" Heb. 3: 14. "The *man* Christ Jesus" became the *adopted* Son of God by his resurrection from the dead; "as it is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." See Acts 13: 30–34; where Paul expressly applies this to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Let the readers of the Examiner look again at our exposition of Ephesians, chap. 1, and see if we have not given sufficient evidence that the adoption, *emphatically*, is not till the resurrection: because the incorruptibility of the entire man is essential to it, and that is THE HOPE of the Gospel.

Perhaps we ought to make the additional remark, on Br. Grew's view of God's "purpose to have mercy on whom he will have mercy"—that God has himself clearly specified "on whom he *will* have mercy:" *viz*: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and HE WILL HAVE MERCY UPON HIM:" Isa. 55: 7. No other promise, or "purpose of the mercy of the spiritual birth" has God made, or revealed. So we believe; but we have neither time nor room to enter into that discussion: those who wish to see it discussed in all its length and breadth are advised to read "Fletcher's Checks." That work can be had of almost any Methodist Preacher, and is worth its weight in gold.

PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE.

A Protestant Synod was held in France in September last, which was the first for more than a hundred years. Protestantism has existed there, but without an established human creed; and it seems the late Synod would not consent to have one imposed upon them. The effort was made to introduce one by Count Gasparin and Mr. Mond, but was a failure. In the report of speeches on the occasion, the following remarks were made, and are deeply interesting.

Mr. Culmann said: "Let us not forget the blessings which have descended upon our churches for the last forty-six years without a formal confession. But we can, and we ought before all things, at the very outset of our re-organization, to make a declaration of our faith, and lay down the principles on which our churches unite; but with this proviso, that it shall not go beyond the basis itself of our faith, that it shall not respect the different Confessions of Faith in our churches; and that it shall be as simple as possible; and employ scriptural terms, and not those of formularies. All of us believe in God the Father, in Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Spirit, whom we implore; but the doctrine of the Trinity belongs to the Schools. We all believe in the necessity of conversion, but the doctrine of original sin belongs to the Schools."

Mr. Grauitz said; "The Gospel should be proclaimed as our only rule. If a Confession of Faith is needed, here is mine. The Reformed Churches of France acknowledge no other authority than the word of God, no other Head than Christ, no other rule than charity."

Mr. Fountanes said: "The *historical Christ* is the foundation, the object, and the principle of Faith. The human mind strives to go farther. Hence comes Confessions of Faith, and systems of Theology. From the second century, historical Confessions of Faith are found. With the council of Nice; began systems of Theology. Whoever puts himself in the presence of Christ, cannot remain a stranger to his spirit. There is no Christian life but by Jesus Christ, and in Jesus Christ. When we enter into explanations, when we wish to know *how* the fullness of the God-head dwells in Jesus Christ, we begin to form a Theological system. We should adhere to the facts of the Gospel. In our times a Confession of doctrinal Faith can not be made. We are all on the march, though some are more advanced than others. What we should lay as the foundation of the church, is the historical Christ. We ought to seek for what is held in common by all."

Mr. Vidal said: "There is too much diversity in the minds of men, to return to Confessions of Faith. They grew old, and no one thought himself bound by them. Truth is immutable, but the expression of truth is visible. Matthew and John did not see the Saviour in the same light. It is dangerous to swear to a Confession, because our convictions are always changing. Diversity of opinions belong to the designs of Providence. What then shall be done? For the foundation of the constitution of the Church, give a definition of the church by certain traits which characterize it. The Bible the only rule of faith; this will separate it from Popery. Jesus Christ the only foundation, on which every one can build according to his own views; this will distinguish it from Judaism, Mahamedanism and Infidelity. It is one thing to lay down Christ as the foundation, and another thing to make a *Christology*, to explain and seek to penetrate the mysteries which God has not seen fit to reveal."

"Mr. Galeef did not wish for Confessions of Faith. He himself believed profoundly in the divinity of Jesus Christ, but if they spoke of the Trinity, it was altogether a different thing. History showed that Confessions had done much harm. These chains are now broken, and no longer are Confessions seriously regarded. Two principles only should be admitted into a Confession—the Gospel and Liberty. We are not Catholics, but Protestants. Let us not labor to forge chains in an age of liberty."

These sentiments are really refreshing. Truly "we are on the march;" and "confessions of doctrinal Faith" will share the fate of all other despotisms. "The Gospel and Liberty"—that's enough.

DR LEE, AND THE BAPTISTS OF S. C.

"These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." Acts 17. 6.

Brother Storrs:—I am anxious that you should know something relative to a Resolution of the Moriah Baptist Association, at their annual meeting, 1848, held with the Fork Hill Church, Lancaster District, S. C. The Resolution is to this effect by way of advice: "We advise the Beulah and Meadow Branch Churches, to deal promptly with their *delinquent members*, especially such as sow the *seed of discord* among the brethren." To whom, think you, this resolution or advice, alludes? To Rev. J. P. Pritchard and myself. This Association, in her wisdom! considers the circulation of your Six Sermons *Delinquency* and Discord!! J. P. Pritchard, and your humble servant I. F. Lee, have circulated your sermons: Ergo, in the wisdom of the Moriah Baptist Association, we have been found delinquents, sowing the *seeds* of discord!!! Our names, it is true, are not mentioned, but we are the individuals to whom the resolution alludes. We both acknowledge the *fact*, that we have circulated the sermons, and what seems an aggravation of the offence to the Association, I hereby declare, that since the resolution was passed, I have circulated them, and will circulate all on hand, and as soon as they are disposed of, I intend to send on for 200 more, and if that will not do, I will obtain 1000. This, by the grace of God, I solemnly declare I mean to do—not with the view of provoking the displeasure of the sapient logicians, who framed the resolution, and introduced the subject before the Association, but solely to extend the spread of truth—to disseminate a correct knowledge of the punishment which God declares he will inflict upon the wicked. In viewing the numerous passages of scripture, relative to the destruction of the wicked, I am astonished to think that any assembly of Christians, more especially Baptists, should come to the resolution, that to proclaim the destruction of the wicked is a combination of delinquency and discord. Is not this virtually saying, that to preach the word of God on the subject, is to sow the seed of discord among the brethren? Now, Baptists are very tenacious of the meaning of the word baptize, from baptizo, and all our reasoning upon the subject is derived principally, if not wholly, from the import, or meaning of the word. As a Baptist, I avow this—nor am I more attached to the meaning of one word, than another. I am no respecter of words,—no respecter of persons, when I say, that it becomes our duty to be impartial, and pay as much deference and respect to one word as to another. It is our duty to understand the meaning of the words, *die*, *death*, *perish*, destroy, destruction, consume, devour, kill, utter destruction, *utterly perish*, everlasting destruction, literally; as well as buried with him in baptism, going down into the water, and coming up out of the water—&c. &c.: and I am fully persuaded in my mind, that there is no Greek or Latin scholar on earth, of candor and truth, who will not readily acknowledge, that according to the original or primary meaning of the above words (relative to the wicked)—the doctrine contained in your Six Sermons is clearly proved according to the word of God. It is the word of God. I say this as a christian man, and as a classical scholar. There are those now living who know that I speak the truth when I say, that I am not ignorant of the languages—that the day was when I could write a letter in Latin as easily as I now pen these desultory thoughts, &c., &c. But this is not to the purpose, though there are some in the Association, who cannot doubt what I affirm. Now sir, to call the preaching of the Gospel, or the circulation of your Six Sermons, which contain the doctrine of the Gospel upon the subject, &c. &c. *delinqueney*, and sowing *the seed of discord*, is something so strange to me, that I believe it must have been done ignorantly. I cannot think that the Association (the delegates composing it) could have read your Sermons; I cannot believe that they had an opportunity to judge understandingly upon the subject. On the contrary, I am forced to conclude, painful as it is, that they were imposed upon most egregiously by *false pretexts*, misrepresentations, &c. It is not for me to say how this has been accomplished, or by whom. But one thing I do proclaim, that in that Association, there was not one man, nor any number of men, nor all the men put together, who had any hand in introducing the subject or framing the resolution, who have the ability to answer your Sermons, or prove that the destruction of the wicked is not a Bible truth. Were they ten thousand times more intelligent than they are, they would fail to do it, as surely as though they had attempted to prove that the square described upon the side opposite the right angle, is not equal to the square of the base and perpendicular containing said angle. I am truly sorry to see my brethren expose their ignorance. It is not for me to suggest, either by surmise, or conception, or insinuation, any thing discreditable to that body in general. Would to God I could conscientiously say, that I had reason to believe there were not four or five there imbued with any thing but candor, honesty, truth, or charity towards others. Well, if there were any there in the gall of bitterness, I pray they may obtain mercy, if peradventure the Lord may grant them repentance. But enough. I am afraid to yield to my feelings, lest I err in judgment. I am thankful, however, that every attempt hitherto to cast reproach on me has in the end turned to my good. I can rejoice in the truth, and am willing to bear reproach for the truth's sake, though I at the same time am truly sorry to see some of my brethren led astray—while some say, that the word of the Lord is the seed of that malignant Goddess among the ancients, *Discordia!* Alas! can you tell the name of this sin! To call the word of the Lord the seed of discord? and the preaching of it delinquency? And here permit me to end my remarks relative to the wisdom and charity and kindness of the Association.

And now in conclusion, permit me, in my very heart, to wish, and desire, and fervently implore, that God, in his abundant mercy, may spare you, and prosper and bless you and yours with every thing necessary to constitute your happiness, and ensure honor, and glory and immortality, eternal life. Amen.

Meltonsville, N. C. I. F. Lee.

Scripture Expositions.— Necessity compels us to exclude our notes on Ephesians this month. We have written an exposition of that Epistle, and the first of Peter, having made those Epistles the subject of study and preaching, exclusively, for the last three months. What we publish is but a mere outline of our discourses; which we trust have been of much profit to our hearers; and it was thro' their suggestion that we first thought of giving any part to the public. We have cause for gratitude to God for the abundant consolation he has granted us in this study and ministration. Never have we enjoyed a deeper and sweeter sense of his love and presence; to his name be all the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The purpose expressed at the commencement of the present volume to give our readers large extracts from English works, on the immortality question, obliges us, if we keep it, to exclude much that we would willingly insert were it otherwise. We know we hazard the imputation of neglect from some of our correspondents; but we cannot help it; unless they can raise us funds to enable us to publish semi-monthly or weekly.

☞ All remittances for the Bible Examiner, and communications relating to its business, should be directed to Geo. Storrs, Philadelphia, Pa., in our *absence*, as at other times.

BIBL

"PROVE AL

VOL. IV.

GEORGE STORRS
JOHN T. WALS

Published Monthly,
PHILADE

Terms.—Single copy, for on
eight copies, $3; or thirteen c

☞ This paper is subje

THE DISCUSS

To Mr. J. T. Walsh:
exist after death till the re

My Dear Sir:—I am
already discussed to our
in this article, call atten
not before noticed in th

First. The express co
of Sadducees. Their v
expressed in *Acts 23d*,
say there is no *resurrecti*
but the Pharisees confe

Here are three negat
the Sadducees, and thei
and on each of them, Pa
isee.

What was the creed
presented? They den
man, by denying both t
and the separate existe

There is no way to e
to deny the reference o
soul or spirit of man, di
could they mean? Ma
the topic under consider

1. By spirit they mea
angels, because they ar

2. They believed in
reference is not to him.

3. They did deny the
as well as the resurrect
tural that they should b
as the Pharisees believe
that by "spirit" we are
man before the resurre

Secondly. In Matt. 22
we have a detailed co
and some of the leade
urge what they conside
future existence, as wel
body. In answering
utters this remarkable la
as touching the resurre
not read that which was
saying, I am the God of
Isaac, and the God of Ja
God is not the God of t

There are two points
ticular attention.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1849. No. 5.

GEORGE STORRS, Editor and Publisher.

JOHN T. WALSH, Associate Editor.

Published Monthly, at 18 Chester Street, PHILADELPHIA, Pa.

Terms.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; always in advance.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

To Mr. J. T. Walsh:—*Does the soul consciously exist after death till the resurrection?*

My Dear Sir:—I am content to leave the points already discussed to our readers. I will, therefore, in this article, call attention to a few considerations not before noticed in this friendly discussion.

First. The express condemnation of the doctrine of Sadducees. Their views are comprehensively expressed in *Acts 23d, 8th.*—"For the Sadducees say there is no *resurrection*, neither *angel*, nor *spirit;* but the Pharisees confess both."

Here are three negative positions embraced by the Sadducees, and their opposite by the Pharisees, and on each of them, Paul declares *himself a Pharisee.*

What was the creed of the Sadducees as here presented? They denied a future existence for man, by denying both the resurrection of the body, and the separate existence of the soul, or spirit.

There is no way to escape the force of this, but to deny the reference of the word "*spirit*" to the *soul* or spirit of man, disembodied. But what else could they mean? Man's hope and destiny was the topic under consideration.

1. By spirit they meant something distinct from angels, because they are mentioned separately.

2. They believed in a God, and therefore the reference is not to him.

3. They did deny the spiritual existence of man as well as the resurrection of the body. How natural that they should be named together, *especially* as the Pharisees believed *both.* I believe therefore that by "spirit" we are to understand the spirit of man before the resurrection of the body.

Secondly. In Matt. 22d, from the 23d to the 32d, we have a detailed conversation between Christ and some of the leaders of this sect, when they urge what they considered a fatal objection to a future existence, as well as the resurrection of the body. In answering this objection the Saviour utters this remarkable language, 31 and 32—"But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob!

God is not the God of the dead but of the living."

There are two points to which I wish to call particular attention.

1. God *is* the God of Abraham, but God is not the God of the *dead*, and therefore, Abraham, though in appearance, and in the language of men dead, he is not *really* so, otherwise God would not be his God. With any other view the text contradicts itself.

2. God is only the God of the *actually* living, while he is the God of Abraham, therefore Abraham is actually living.

You will reply, perhaps, that it is the *resurrection* the Saviour is proving. But the word of necessity implies nothing more than a future life, to stand up, to live again, and the context obliges us to give it this definition in this place. 1. Because of the declaration "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage" which *must* be understood as tantamount to, *in the future life*, "they neither marry," &c.

2. Because Christ declares Abraham *then* living, which fully disproved the doctrine of the Sadducees.

If it be said he calls God the God of Abraham in view of his *subsequent* resurrection to life "at the last day," I reply: 1. The text does not declare that God is the God of those *now dead*, but who *are* to live, but emphatically "God *is not* the God of the *dead*, but of the *living*"—those *actually now living.*

2. Abraham's future resurrection to life and consciousness, ceases to be a matter of *rational* expectation, unless his soul still exists in a conscious state.

I submit it to the reason of the unbiased, that if there be no soul, separate and distinct from the body, capable of living after that has died, there is no such being as Abraham of Mesopotamia in existence.

There being no such person, he cannot be raised from the dead, for the obvious reason, that a being that does not *exist*, cannot have a resurrection.

The appeal to omnipotence will avail nothing in this case, for omnipotence cannot do, what in the *nature* of things is contradictory and impossible.

God can create another being resembling *Abraham*, but he would not be *the* Abraham that once "dwelt in tents with Sarah and Isaac, heirs of the promise," but another; and if made to feel he was, he would be deceived. And hence I fully believe your view destroys the hope even of a future resurrection. The two doctrines live together and die together. Another being created to take my place could not recognize my previous affections as his own.

After a thousand years, during which time I have not only failed to think, but the whole power of thought has become annihilated—my *whole* being returned to the dust from which it was taken—my resurrection is an utter absurdity.

Third. Another passage is found in Matt. 17th, 2d. "And there appeared unto them *Moses* and *Elias* talking with him." Here I believe both doc-

trines are illustrated and confirmed to the disciples. Here was Elijah in a resurrection body confirming that doctrine. Here was Moses, who died and was buried 1400 years before, a proof of the other doctrine contended for.

But had not both bodies? I cannot say, though both were made known to the disciples, what was their appearance. *God* sometimes assumes a body and makes his *angels* to appear as men, *spirits* or *flaming fire*. Could he not clothe, for the time, the soul of Moses in a body, as it pleased him?

There is no proof that he was raised from the dead, i. e. that his body was raised, and if you deny my declaration, you must base that denial on sheer assumption.

My dear sir, on this side of the question I have now done. I am most respectfully and truly your friend and brother, W. H. Brewster.

—

Reply to Mr. Brewster.

Dear Sir,—In your article you base an argument,

1st. On "the express condemnation of the doctrine of the Saducees."

Truly, in Acts 23d, 8th, it is said "For the Sadducees say there is no *resurrection*, neither *angel* nor *spirit*." What is the *force* of this passage? The Sadducees, by denying a "*resurrection*," as a necessary consequence, denied the existence of "*angels and spirits*;" thus predicating the existence of them upon *their* resurrection. There seems to be a hint here, that "angels" have attained to their present condition by a previous probation and resurrection from the dead. This idea receives support from the Mosaic account of Man's fall, &c. According to this view, the existence of "*spirits*" should be predicated on the resurrection of *men*. The saints, when raised, are termed the "*spirits* of just men made *perfect*." But this merely by the way.

"The Pharisees confess *both*." "*Both*" what? The term "both," refers to *two* only. But you say "here are *three* negative positions embraced by the Sadducees, and their opposite by the Pharisees, and on each of them, Paul declares *himself* a *Pharisee*."

Now the term "*both*," referring to *two* things only, must be applied to "angels and spirits," whose existence is predicated upon a resurrection, or else, if you apply it to "angels and spirits," you must leave out of the question the "*resurrection*," altogether! And, accordingly, we do find just such an idea among some of the Pharisaic Jews, who affirmed, "that the resurrection was passed," the soul having gone to heaven at death, "and overthrow the faith of some."

But, waiving all this, did Paul affirm "himself a Pharisee" in the *three* particulars above noticed? He has not left us to *infer* his meaning, for in the 6th verse he tells us in what sense he is a Pharisee. He says—"I am a Pharisee—*concerning* the *hope* and *resurrection* of the *dead*, I am called in question." So there is no evidence that he was a Pharisee, believing in all the paganism of disembodied spirits, and "ghosts of frightful mien."

After asking what was "the creed of the Sadducess," you reply, "they denied a future existence for man, *by* denying *both* the resurrection of the body, and the separate existence of the soul, or spirit." Now, if you had finished the sentence at the term "body," you would have expressed the truth in the case, for the Sadducees truly "denied a future existence for man, *by denying the resurrection of the body*"—upon which that "existence" depends! But denying *this*, the *other* followed as a necessary conclusion.

2. Your second argument is founded on Mat. xxii. 23—32.

Now, be it remembered, the Sadducees affirmed there was no resurrection; (see 23d verse,) and consequently no future life for man. Death, with them, was an "eternal sleep;" and for the purpose of puzzling the Lord, they asked him—whose the woman shall be in the resurrection, for the seven had her? They did not ask whose wife she shall be in the intermediate state, or the state between death and the resurrection; but whose wife she shall be in the *resurrection*? The Lord replied, "ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection, (not in the state of the dead,) they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven;" thus predicating the angelic nature upon the resurrection. He continues, "but as *concerning the resurrection of the dead*, (not their *separate* existence,) have you not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the *dead*, (who live no more, as you suppose) but of the living;" that is, of those who shall live again by a resurrection, which you Sadducees deny. Such is the obvious meaning of the passage. You say "God is not the God of the dead"—that is, of those who are "*really* dead;" then by what logic will you make him the God of those who are *half dead*? Again you say, "God is only the God of the *actually living*;" but why prefix "really" and "actually" before "dead" and "living?" Do not the words express the ideas? Men are either dead or alive, and therefore the case stands thus:

1. God is not the God of the dead;
But Abraham is dead;
Therefore God is not the God of Abraham.
This is not the true position; let us try another.

2. Living men are not the subjects of a resurrection;
But Abraham. Isaac and Jacob are living;
Therefore *they* will not be raised from the dead.

Are you willing to endorse this? Perhaps not; let us try again:

3. God is not the God of the dead, who live no more;
But Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will live again;
Therefore God is the God of Abraham, &c.

This expresses the truth on the subject, and *both of us* can endorse it with all the heart!

I have no objection to your definition of the term resurrection—"to stand up, or *live again*." It is a RE-*living*, or living again, and necessarily implies the previous *death* of the subject. No death, no re-surrection; no re-surrection, no future life.

You speak of "Abraham's resurrection to *life* and *consciousness*" as "ceasing to be a matter of *rational* expectation, unless his soul still exists in a *conscious* state." Really, I should like for you to help me to an understanding—a "*rational*" understanding of this sentence! In the first place, you endow Abraham with "*life* and *consciousness*"

while dead, and then, strange to tell, *raise* him to "life and consciousness"! He will then have a *double life* and *double consciousness!* May we not say, that, *if Abraham's soul exists in a state of "life and consciousness,"* his resurrection to "life and consciousness" "ceases to be a matter of rational expectation"? It would, indeed, be an *absurd* "expectation."

You then "submit it to the reason of the unbiassed, that if there be no soul, separate from the body, there is no such being as Abraham in existence." Further on you say, "There being no such person he cannot be raised from the dead, for the obvious reason that a being that does not *exist*, cannot have a resurrection."

Here you have precipitated yourself against the sharp rocks of skepticism, and cannot save yourself without "suffering loss."

If Abraham's soul is not living, you say he does not exist; and, consequently, he cannot be raised from the dead. This is your argument. Of course, then, the *body* of Abraham, to say nothing of his soul, has *no existence;* and this, according to your view, can never be raised: so that you are driven to the dreadful alternative of denying the resurrection of the body *in toto!* Then, if there be any resurrection, *it* must be affirmed of the *spirit;* but this, according to your view, *is alive*, and therefore cannot be the subject of a resurrection to life. So your view leads to a denial of the resurrection altogether. Here, then, we have this *Pago-Christianized Theology* to the life. The spirit or soul survives the body—*this* returns to dust, and ceases to exist—therefore it can never be raised—therefore the grave will never yield up its prey, but have the "victory"—therefore we can never sing, "*O! grave where is thy victory*"—therefore the sea will never give up its dead—therefore death is an "eternal sleep"! From such theology good Lord deliver us! But this is the *legitimate* tendency of the popular doctrine. It leads the mind back to Infidelity and Paganism. I am sorry, truly so, to find friend Brewster advocating such views.

Again, you say, "the appeal to omnipotence will avail nothing, for omnipotence cannot do, what, in the *nature* of things, is contradictory and impossible." My good sir, you are in company with those Athenians who mocked when they heard Paul on the "resurrection of the *dead*," and with those to whom he said—"Why should it be thought *incredible* that God should raise the *dead?*" Is there anything in the "*nature*" of the resurrection "contradictory and impossible"? I am almost constrained to say—"You do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the *power* of God;" for if the body has no existence, and cannot be raised, Paul erred when he said—"Our vile *bodies* shall be *fashioned* like his most glorious body." And, "if the spirit of Him who raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your *mortal bodies* by his spirit that dwelleth in you."

But how can a body be "fashioned" when it has "no existence?" Or how can "mortal bodies" be *made alive* if they have no "existence?" This, according to your view, is "contradictory and impossible." The resurrection is, in a qualified sense, a *new creation;* but it is the reorganization of the former body. If this be not so, how is it, that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may RECEIVE IN BODY, the things he has done, whether good or bad?" And how are they who "*sleep in the* DUST *of the earth* to awake?" How is the "*earth to cast out her dead?*" as the Prophet says.

May I not adopt your language, and, with all the emphasis I can give it, declare that, IF YOUR *view be correct*, THE "RESURRECTION IS AN ABSURDITY?"

3d. Your third proof is Mat. 17: 2, on which I shall be brief. And,

1st. We may remark, that the whole transaction is a "*vision*," and does not necessarily involve the *personal* presence of Moses and Elijah. But,

2d. Granting they were there *personally*, what does it prove? Of Moses it is said that he *died*, and the Lord *buried* him. The *man Moses died*, and the *man Moses* was *buried*; and if he *personally* appeared on the Mount of Transfiguration, he must have been raised from the dead.

Of Elijah it is said he went up to heaven in a chariot of fire, and no difficulty is presented in his case; but how you invest him with a "*resurrection body*," I cannot conceive. Elijah was not the subject of a "*resurrection*," but a *translation*. All he left when he went up was his *mantle*, which he left as a legacy to Elisha. It is said that the "Devil disputed about the *body* of Moses," but we have no evidence that Elijah left his body as a legacy to his Satanic Majesty, and received another as he went up.

You say, "there is no proof that Moses was raised from the dead." The very fact of his appearing on the mount, is "proof" to my mind.

You say, "*God* sometimes assumes a body," &c. Where is the proof of this? The *bodies* of "angels" are not "assumed." They "appear as men," because this is their form. Man was made in their image. I regard it, therefore, as a "sheer assumption" on your part to deny the resurrection of Moses. If he *personally* appeared on the Mount, he was certainly raised, and his *presence* there would be the proof.

In conclusion you say, "On *this* side of the question I have now done."

O! that I could hope soon to have you on *this* side of the question, contending for incorruptibility, immortality and eternal life in Christ, by a resurrection from the dead!

Shall I not hear from you on the passages previously quoted? I have much additional testimony in store, and should like to have an opportunity of presenting it; if not in hope of changing your views, at least for the benefit of our readers. May the Lord bless us both, lead us into all truth, and give us an abundant entrance into his everlasting kingdom, is the prayer of your sincere friend,

JNO. T. WALSH.

PHILADELPHIA, April 30th, 1849.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

EPHESIANS II. AND III.

VERSES 11 and 12. Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands. That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.

The apostle having previously clearly stated their high calling, and the exalted standing to which they had now attained, next gives them a word of caution. "Wherefore remember," call to mind, recollect—"that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh"—that is, were not of the nation in covenant with God—"remember that at that time ye were without Christ,"—Christ being of the Jews, and not previously having been proclaimed to them—"being aliens"—strangers to, ignorant of, separate—"from the commonwealth of Israel," not citizens; and as a consequence—"strangers from the covenants of promise,"—not allied to God in covenant—"having no hope"—of the resurrection from the dead: or, of the adoption of children, "and without God in the world,"—atheists in the world; having no knowledge of the true God or the nature of his service, nor of that glorious state to which God designed to raise the holy and unblamable in love.

VERSE 13. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

"But now in Christ Jesus"—by the regenerating power of "the word of truth," which is the seed in producing a union with Christ, who is the *truth*, as well as the life; so that now—"ye who sometime were afar off,"—that is, *aliens*—"are made nigh"—no longer aliens, but brought to be worshippers of the true God—"by the blood of Christ." Christ was of the Jews by blood. When his blood was shed, or his life received by descent from Abraham was given up, his relation to them, "after the flesh," being dissolved, he enters into relation with persons out of all nations by the Spirit of Life, or through the spirit by which he lives forever more, and which raised him up from the dead.

VERSES 14—18. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father.

"For he is our peace"—*i. e.*, he is the author of it—"who hath made both"—Jews and Gentiles—"one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition,"—the wall of division—"having abolished"—made useless, rendered worthless—"in his flesh"—i. e., in his sufferings—"the enmity"—that which was the cause of the division between Jews and Gentiles—"even the law of commandments contained in ordinances"—those under which the Jews had heretofore been held; which by the sufferings and death of Christ were now rendered worthless. In bringing about the death of Christ both Jews and Gentiles were active agents—united in his crucifixion—and could therefore have no just cause of complaint if they were all placed upon the same footing. The purpose of God was, now that Christ had made useless the law of ordinances—"to make in himself [Christ] of twain [Jews and Gentiles] *one new man*"—bringing both into union with himself, so that they should constitute *one body*, while he [Christ] would be *the head* of this "new" and spiritual creation; thus constituting "ONE *new man*;" as perfectly united together as the head and body of the one animal man—"so making peace"—or concord, union, harmony, between those who before were in discord:—and that he might reconcile both [Jews and Gentiles] unto God *in one body* by the cross"—by his death—"having slain the enmity thereby"—the animosity existing between them; that is, his condemnation and death was the occasion of the hostile parties uniting together, [see Acts 4: 27,] as some great and deeply interesting event, not unfrequently, unites men from extreme points, as well as abolishing the law of commandments—"and came"—by his ambassadors—"preaching"—proclaiming—"peace"—reconciliation—"to you who were afar off"—who were aliens, *i. e.*, Gentiles—"and to them that were nigh"—the Jews: "for through him [Christ] we both [Jews and Gentiles] have access," admission, "by one spirit"—even that spirit which was upon Christ our head without measure—"unto the Father." Being united with Christ as a branch to the vine, or to keep to the figure of the apostle, as the members of the one body are united with the head and partake of whatever life animates that, so all the members in Christ have access through their head, by the spirit of life in him, to the Father, and in no other way: for, saith the Savior, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me."

VERSES 19—22. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

"Ye"—Gentile christians—"are no more strangers and foreigners" as ye were once—"but fellow-citizens"—that is, are united under one head and system of government and favor—"with the saints"—the holy ones who first hoped in Christ; [see chap. 1: 12,]—"and of the household" family—"of God." The apostle now changes the figure to a building—"And are built upon"—rest firmly on—"the foundation"—the word of truth, the gospel of their salvation, [chap. 1: 13,] proclaimed—"of the apostles"—messengers of Christ, "and prophets"—either those of the Old Testament, or those of the New, or both—"Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone"—that without which there would be neither union or strength in the building: and he was that of which prophets and apostles all testified who spake of salvation for men; and which was chosen of God to be the head or foundation of the new, or spiritual creation—"in whom all the building"—the whole body of saints, "fitly framed together"—each part adapted to its place and in its proper position. Any part of a building out of its place weakens the whole: but properly adjusted it becometh, or—"groweth unto a holy temple in"—or, *on*—"the Lord"—he being the head stone, or foundation—"in whom," or, on which—"ye also are builded together"—built up in company, each forming a part of the structure—"for a habitation"—an abode, residence, a home—"of God through"—*en*—by "the Spirit." The church, the spiritual building, is designed of God as the home, the abode, the residence of his Spirit: first resting in Christ without measure, and from him flowing into every soul built on him; thus making them partakers of the

divine nature; and, ultimately, exalting them to the immortal honor of a tabernacle, for God, that shall not be taken down, and eternally be that temple through which he will manifest his glory before other created intelligences: and this is "the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints:" see chap. 1: 18. Let us see to it, that none of us put forth a hand to mar or injure any person, even one of the least, composing this building, or that God is endeavoring to bring into its structure. The least of all may be as important, in its place, as the greatest; and, indeed, fills a place that the greatest could not occupy.

CHAP. III. VERSES 1—7. For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles; if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote afore in few words: whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ. Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit: that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel: whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power.

The first verse seems to be the commencement of an exhortation which is interrupted to the close of the chapter, and then resumed at the first verse following. Paul, for preaching the word of truth, the good news of salvation, to the Gentiles, was grievously persecuted by the Jews, and at length is found a "prisoner" at Rome, from whence he sent out this epistle. He calls to their mind the fact that he was a prisoner for their sakes, on their account; and then reverts to his call to preach Jesus Christ to them, and says, "If ye have heard of the dispensation"—of the charge or trust committed—"of the grace"—favor—"of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation" the Lord Jesus *unveiled* himself to him, so that he saw him, and received his mission directly from Christ; and in such manner as precluded all doubt on the subject of his call and work: see Acts 26: 12—18, and 1 Corth. 15: 5—8: at this time, Jesus—"made known unto me the mystery"—the secret—"which in other ages"—or previous dispensations—"was not made known as it is now revealed"—uncovered, brought to light, rendered conspicuous—"unto the holy apostles and prophets"—persons who communicated truths directly by inspiration of God: and such there were in the days of the apostles: see Acts 11: 27, 28, and 13: 1, 2; and other places. To these prophets and apostles God made known clearly—"by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body"—with the Jews—"and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel"—which promise is, that all, without regard to nation, that become holy and blameless in love, shall have "the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," or, be made partakers of his incorruptibility and endless life: of which glorious tidings, Paul says—"I was made a minister"—or, a servant, to the Gentiles—"by the effectual working of his power:" see again Acts 26: 12—17.

VERSE 8. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.

"Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints"—or, holy ones, that is, the least of all the apostles, as is evident from 1 Corth. 15: 8, 9, which see—"is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Christ has *riches;* and they are unsearchable, and so extensive that they cannot be explored, nor exhausted. Let us dwell here a moment. What are we called to? First, a *union* with Christ: to become his bride. Of course partners in his treasures, honors, and whatever belongs to him. Let this truth be proclaimed. But who and what are we? Mortal, corruptible, dying creatures; whose foundation is in the dust; and all of whose tendencies are to return to dust again; with no principle of immortality or endless life in ourselves. To such creatures Christ is proclaimed, as seeking to bring us into a relation to himself of the nearest and most interesting character. Men are allured by the charm of *riches*, gold, inexhaustible mines; that wakes up their whole being, and they eagerly inquire what it is, where it is, how they can find it, how they may possess themselves of those treasures; and if they find there is even a chance for success in the pursuit, they enter at once on the expedition, hazarding all the labor, toil, risk, suffering, or privation that may be attending the enterprise. Now, says the apostle, I come to proclaim to you riches unsearchable, a mine that is inexhaustible in Christ. He is the Son of the living God, and heir of God: heir of his incorruptibility, glory, endless life, and whatever pertains to the fulness of God. He proposes to share these riches with us: and in exchange for this short and fleeting life to give us an endless life: instead of these corruptible bodies to give us incorruptible ones: instead of the dishonor of consuming in the grave, by worms, to raise us to crowns of glory that fade not away; in a word, to give us riches as much more glorious, valuable, and durable than the richest diamonds, or the most refined and pure gold, as they exceed the most worthless and loathsome object that earth bears upon its surface. But all comparison fails, and we feel the deepest sense of weakness in the attempt, and leave it to your own reflections to follow up the contemplation of the honor, glory, and riches that are so freely offered to us in Jesus Christ.

VERSES 9—12. And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God. According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord; in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.

"To make all see"—to enlighten all: not the Jews only, but those of every nation—"what the fellowship"—participation, communion—"of the mystery"—the secret of the calling of the Gentiles, "which from the beginning of the world"—or, ages—"hath been hid in God"—not known as now, though in the purpose of God—"who created"—caused to exist, formed, instituted, or, formed anew, regenerated, renovated; [it may relate here entirely to the "one new man," chap 2: 15, or the one "body," verse 6; the regeneration committed to Christ,]—"all things by"—through, or, in—"Jesus Christ: to the intent that"—in order that—"now unto principalities"—authorities—

"and powers"—rulers—"in heavenly things"—in things relating to the kingdom of God, or the regeneration—"might be known by"—or *in*—"the church the manifold"—the immense, the infinite, "wisdom of God." The whole scheme of creation, redemption, and renovation, is one of boundless wisdom; faintly manifested at first, and but imperfectly understood until after the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, and the consequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the further gift of prophecy in the days of the apostles, by which was made known, vastly more perfectly than in any previous dispensation, the boundless wisdom of God in the work of renovation, progressing to a completeness and perfection never before conceived of by the sons of men; not even the most enlightened, *viz.*, the Jews; and which even the first christians, not excepting the apostles, were slow to learn: so much so that the Saviour said, "Oh unwise and slow of heart to believe;" and Peter had to be taught in a vision, by a sheet let down from heaven, even after his baptism of the Holy Spirit: and our Lord Jesus had personally to appear to Paul with light from heaven that overpowered him, before the church fully understood, or engaged in earnest to carry out God's designs of mercy and salvation to the Gentiles; which design was not new, for it was "according to the eternal purpose," according to the determination before the ages: that is, before either the Christian or Jewish ages; and as expressed, or *set forth, exposed to view*, [for so the original word here translated *purpose*, signifies,] to Abraham, when God informed him, that in his seed, which is Christ, all the families of the earth should be blessed: this was that "which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," that "the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and partakers of his promise in Christ Jesus;" verse 6: "in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him." Through the promise of God, and the knowledge of his purpose to make us, Gentiles, partakers in the adoption of children, we now have access to God, with a firm reliance upon his mercy to us, who are in Christ, united to Christ, in the one body. Glorious privilege, glorious calling, glorious hope: and let the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ have glory now and evermore, through our head and deliverer, the Son of God.

IS THIS AGE FINAL, OR PREPARATORY?

No. I.

Most Christians are looking for a glorious state of triumph for the Church of Christ on this earth. Do the Scriptures warrant such an expectation? Let the word of truth decide the question, and not our prejudices or fancies. We go back to the time of Moses; Numb. 14: 21, "But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Here is a most solemn oath of the living God. Has the promise made by this oath ever yet been fulfilled? Surely, none can be at a loss for an answer. How did the Psalmist understand this subject? See Psalms 22. 27. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." Has this prophecy ever had its fulfilment? Certainly not. But he tells us when it shall be, *viz:* When "the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is Governor among the nations;" verse 28. At that time it is said "a seed shall serve him: it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. They shall come [the seed,] and shall declare his righteousness unto *a people that shall be born*, that he hath done this." Here is a people to be born, after the kingdom is the Lord's, who are to be taught the works God has wrought in subjecting the nations. This portion of Scripture needs no further comment to show that the events spoken of are future, and they are not "*conditional;*" a phrase much used by those who, though not designedly, are, in fact, turning the Scriptures into "a cunningly devised fable."

That we do not misunderstand the Psalmist in this matter, let us look at Psalm 72, where speaking of Messiah's reign, he says, "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." At the 17th verse he adds:—"His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed." In view of that glorious period he breaks out in praise and prayer, verses 18 and 19, "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen, and amen." These are no dark sayings; but full, clear and plain. It does not require a Solomon to show that this prophecy is unconditional, future in its accomplishment, and before the new earth dispensation. See verse 8. "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." Compare this with Rev. 21: 1—"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away: and there was no more sea." The two periods are as distinct as language can make them; and it seems to us, the impartial mind cannot fail to see it.

Let us next examine Psalms. 102: 13—22, "Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favor her, yea, the set time is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favor the dust thereof. *So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory. When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.* He will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer. *This shall be written for the generation to come: and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord.* For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth. To hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death. To declare the name of the Lord in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem. WHEN THE PEOPLE ARE GATHERED TOGETHER AND THE KINGDOMS, TO SERVE THE LORD." Here the language is clear. It is at a time when the Lord personally appears in his glory. This was written for a future period: and the people which shall be created shall then praise the Lord. The Prophet Habakkuk says: "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," Hab. 2: 14. This certainly relates to the future.

IN THAT AGE, THE JEWS MISSIONARIES.

The Prophet records from the mouth of the Lord, Zech. 8: 21—22. "And the inhabitants of one city

shall go to another, saying, let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts: I will go also. *Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord.*" Here is a prophecy too plain to be mistaken. The next verse shows that this is to be at a time when the Jews will be missionaries to "the nations." The objector may say "Jews are the spiritual seed." If that is admitted it does not in the least affect the argument; because there are those "of the nations" who are not Jews; and these "take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, we will go with you for we have heard God is with you." We understand, of course, that it is the literal Jews that are spoken of in this verse; and we believe the remnant of them, who escape the terrible judgments with which that period will be ushered in, will be converted at the manifestation of Christ personally to them as he manifested himself to Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus. At that manifestation they will weep and mourn as described, Zech. 12: 10—14; and it will not be the mourning of despair, but of genuine repentance for having so long rejected their true Messiah, the crucified Jesus: "in that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness;" Zech. 13: 1: and the iniquity of that land will be "removed in one day:" see Zech. 3: 9. This people, thus saved, not changed to immortality, but among the "left of the nations," [Zech. 14: 16,] will be the first or chief of the nations, during the next age or dispensation, and will be employed as suggested by the text, Zech. 8: 23, that is, as missionaries, successful missionaries to "all languages of the nations." Under their labors among those left of the nations, "many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord."

A QUESTION.

In Heb. 2: 14, the apostle, speaking of Christ, says: "that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil." Again, in John 3: 8, it is said, "for this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Here the two inspired witnesses speak too plain to be misunderstood. They mean simply this, that Christ will *destroy* the DEVIL and his WORKS."

Will some one that believes in the immortality, and never ending sins and torments of those persons that die in their sins,—and the immortality and never ending sins and torments of the devil, tell me how, and when, Christ will bring about the great event of destroying the devil and his works?

E. W. KNIGHT.

Glenns Falls, N. Y.

DOES IT DO ANY GOOD?

We have heard so many sneers from a certain quarter against the view we entertain on the immortality question—and it has been so significantly said "I never heard of the doctrine doing any good," that we have concluded to give these *ignorant* persons two items, among many within our knowledge, of good done by the *hated* doctrine.

OSWEGO, Ind., April 1st, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—For your encouragement I would state, that the "Six Sermons" have been blessed in bringing some dear souls to the correct knowledge of Bible Truth. God has been pleased to make a single copy, when introduced into a neighbourhood, a pioneer for the herald of salvation to follow. In this way numbers have been led to know, that *sin and death* came through the first Adam, *and life and immortality* came through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and that God does not send *death* to gather his saints unto himself, but, that he will *send Jesus Christ* to gather them at the second advent, who will present the entire church, as the glorious bride, without spot or wrinkle, unto God his Father, arrayed in beauty, possessing immortality and incorruptibility, whose inheritance will be in the new heavens and new earth—the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and unfading. Hence, a need of the second coming of Christ is felt, and in this manner a way is opened for proclaiming this blessed doctrine.

S. A. CHAPLIN.

TYLER, Ill., March 22d, 1849.

DEAR BROTHER STORRS:—It has now been about two years since your "Six Sermons" first caught my eye. They called in question a doctrine, the truth of which I considered of vast importance; *viz.* the immortality of the soul: for upon this, and the doctrines unavoidably growing out of it, I had based all my hopes of future bliss and glory. I was a Universalist. Believing that all men are a compound of mortality and immortality, destined at the death of the body to ascend in their nobler nature, which was a part of Deity himself, to his own right hand to enjoy his favor forevermore. This, in my estimation, being true, I decided that God would not punish sinners with eternal torments in hell forever, for in so doing he must of necessity punish a part of himself. I was preparing, as fast as my circumstances would permit, to proclaim this, to me, glorious doctrine. But before I had completed my investigation of the "Six Sermons," I became fully satisfied that the entire system [of *natural* immortality] was based upon the serpent's first lie,—"Ye shall not surely die." I rejected it at once, and was led as I believe into a knowledge of the true source of immortality; and to see that God would render unto every one according to their deeds. "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life." Since that time I have felt it my duty to proclaim, according to the ability given, life and immortality through Jesus at his coming and kingdom. During the past year I have travelled through a part of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio: and among those looking for the coming and kingdom of Jesus, I have found but three, who do not believe with you in respect to the nature and destiny of man: one in Illinois, one in Indiana, and one in Ohio. I believe these truths should be kept in the front of all preaching; for they are the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. They strike a death blow to Universalism in all its parts. I have found in conversing with Universalists, since I embraced my present view, that they are entirely unprepared to meet these truths. The weapons

they use so successfully against eternal torments fall lifeless when tried against the Bible view of the destruction of the wicked.

Yours, in hope of Eternal Life,
D. P. HALL.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We have concluded to say a few words as to the prospects of our paper; and especially as some, even of our friends, from our silence and through insinuations of others, have been led to think that the Examiner is amply sustained. We abhor the *everlasting* begging and dunning practiced by some.

From our subscribers we have not received funds sufficient to pay our printer for the present volume; and unless we can realize at least four hundred more new subscribers during this year, we shall be exceedingly embarrassed in finishing the volume for 1849, and shall be plunged in debt, without having received a cent for our personal labors. If half our present subscribers will send us two new ones, each, with the pay in advance, we shall be able to finish the year not only free from debt to the printer, but also a trifle for our own services; at which you will rejoice, if we have contributed any thing to your profit. No subscription will be received for a less time than one volume. All the numbers for 1848 can be had if desired.

Any person who will send us *two* new subscribers, with pay in current money, free of expense to us, we will send a copy of Dobney, in paper cover, without charge. Dobney on Future Punishment, or the end of the Wicked, is the most grand and interesting work that has yet appeared. If any prefer the Six Sermons instead of Dobney's work, as a premium for the two new subscribers, we will send *three* copies of them. We now leave the subject with our friends, to do what they judge best and right.

DR. JOHN T. WALSH.—All letters to him should be addressed PHILADELPHIA, Pa., No. 63 Ogden St.

TOUR EAST, WITH VARIOUS OBSERVATIONS.—Our apology for the lateness of the Examiner this month, is our absence. After our last went to press we concluded not to issue the May number till our return. We left Philadelphia March 28th at six o'clock in the morning, and arrived in New York City, 100 miles, at half past one, P. M., where we were welcomed to the hospitable home of our old friend Henry F. Johnson. A meeting had been given out for the evening in American Hall, Broadway, where, notwithstanding the wet weather, we had the satisfaction of seeing many old friends, and a good assemblage of attentive hearers, to whom we spoke "of things new and old;" and again in the same place the next evening. Saturday, March 31st, we left New York at 8 o'clock in the morning, by the cars; going north and east we passed through Bridgeport, New Haven, and Hartford in Connecticut, Springfield, and Worcester in Mass., principal towns and cities on the route, and arrived at Boston about six o'clock in the evening, having travelled about 230 miles in ten hours, including stops. This is winging our way fast enough for any age but the present. So has steam entered into the composition of men's minds, in these days, that the means of locomotion are altogether too tardy, and invention is at its "wit's end" to see if some more expeditious means of conveyance cannot be brought into use, whereby the land of promise [California!!] can be gained in "two days" by travelling the heavens above instead of the earth beneath. Yes, they seem determined to travel in the air, and are quite confident that they can succeed, and thus all but annihilate distance, making a pleasant ride, above the clouds, to California or England in "*two days.*" Truly, "man" was "made upright," but we "have sought out *many inventions.*" But all these movements indicate the closing up of the present age, as truly as the attempt to build Babel indicated the confusion of tongues, whereby the devices of men were overthrown to establish the purposes of God.

Sabbath, April 1st, we preached three times in Chapman Hall, Boston, to an attentive congregation. During the week we attended several meetings and preached. Sabbath the 8th, we again spoke to the people three times; and Thursday following, being the State Fast of Mass., we preached twice. In our discourses we took up the signs of the times; the saint's inheritance; the locality of the Kingdom of God; the prospects of the Jews; the nature of the coming age; and the immortality question; as well as practical holiness, or the importance of being Christ-like in our lives and conversation. True, we had to touch all these subjects but slightly, time not allowing us to enlarge upon them; but we have the satisfaction of knowing that what we did say made the people anxious to hear more; and we were strongly importuned to remove to that city, to preach statedly; but we were compelled to decline, believing that the providence of God called us elsewhere. We may again *visit* the friends there, as we were urged to do if we could not take up our residence with them. The house of Br. Prescott Dickinson was our *home* while there; and many have proved his hospitalities as well as we. From Boston we went to Lowell, the city of

Factories. Here we were cheered by the cordial greeting of our beloved brother, the "eminent Methodist preacher," Merrit Bates of the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America." We felt some as Paul did when he met the brethren at "Appiforum, and The Three Taverns" on his way to Rome, and "thanked God, and took courage." It was truly refreshing to meet with one minister of the religion of Jesus Christ who manifests its spirit, and is far removed from the narrow spirit which characterises nearly all religionists of every name and party. Here also we met our old friend and brother Wm. H. Brewster, Br. Walsh's polemical opponent, who is also a minister in the Wesleyan Methodist connection, and preaching in Lowell. Our interview with him was of a most pleasant character, and contrasted amazingly with the narrow spirit of most of our theological opponents. Differ as we may and do on some subjects, we felt that the bonds of christian friendship and fellowship were strong and unbroken. We gave Br. Brewster a copy of Dobney on Future Punishment, and since learn that he was highly pleased with the "first part," which was all that he had read at the time. We hope and trust he may be equally well pleased with the "*Second* part;" and if so, we doubt not, he will become the powerful advocate of "the faith he once destroyed."

We were invited by the official members of the Wesleyan church, to whom Br. Bates ministers, to preach to them on the immortality question. We gave them five Discourses on the subject—two during the week, and three on Sabbath, April 15th. The word spoken was listened to with deep attention. We had both Methodist and Universalist ministers to hear. Br. Bates openly avowed his belief in our view of the end of the wicked; and we doubt not he will be fully sustained by the church and congregation to which he ministers in Lowell; he had preached one discourse to them on the question before our arrival, which made them the more anxious to hear us. Br. Bates went to the Annual Conference of the Wesleyan church, for New England, while we were in Lowell; and though all knew his views on the immortality subject no objection was made to passing his character; the Conference thus manifesting a noble spirit of toleration which does them much honor, and honors the religion they profess. Several copies of Dobney on Future Punishment were disposed of at that Conference, and also of our "Six Sermons." The church at Lowell *unanimously* requested Br. Bates to return and labor among them another year: Br. Brewster also returns to his congregation in Lowell. Our visit to that city was highly gratifying and encouraging. We parted with the friends there, particularly with Br. Bates, with much regret: it was painful to take the final grasp of that brother's hand, with whom we had enjoyed such a refreshing season; but, we shall meet again; so proclaims the voice of faith. A history of that brother's trials and persecutions, in years past, for the truth's sake, is a chapter written in the "book of remembrance;" and will not be forgotten when God shall "make up" his "jewels." He has a part to act, in future; for which may our Lord fully prepare him, and strengthen him mightily in its performance. Eight years has his mind been exercised more or less on the immortality question. When he was Presiding Elder in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the Troy Conference, we sent him a copy of "Three Letters," the first thing we ever published on the subject. Those Letters were originally written to the late Rev. Orange Scott, afterwards founder of the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America," and which he often told us he was unable to answer. It was by his advice we published them; though his name was suppressed as the person to whom they were written. In the spring of 1841 we sent a copy of those Letters to Br. Bates, and the seed then sown has never ceased to vegetate, though sometimes it has lain comparatively dormant, and then starting forth with fresh vigor, till at length it has appeared in strength, and is vigorously manifesting itself.

The "Three Letters" became the basis of the "Six Sermons," which were first published in Albany, N. Y. in the spring of 1842, and *before* we had any thing to do with "Millerism." We make this statement because that theory has often been charged with being the author of the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked as advocated by us in our "Six Sermons." But there was never any connection between the one and the other; and Mr. Miller always opposed our views on the immortality question. It is true that we were drawn into Mr. Miller's theory for a time, but renounced *all* his *peculiarities* more than four years ago, and some of them more than five years since; and have had no connection with his *peculiar* views for more than four years past; the *leaders* in that system are among our opposers.

From Lowell we returned to Boston, and from thence to Springfield, where we were welcomed by many friends, particularly Brethren R. E. Ladd and Moses Stoddard, good men and true, who stand for the right and truth at whatever cost. Sabbath, April 22d, we preached morning and afternoon in Dwight's Hall; and in the evening in the Universalist Church, on the subject,—"No immortality to man except through Jesus Christ." Here we had a large and attentive congregation, to whom we opened and expounded the Scriptures as to the fact, that the death threatened Adam was not a *moral* one, but a literal dissolution of his entire being; from which there is no recovery except by Christ, and no im-

mortality only by a union with Christ, and being made partakers of the divine nature in him; or, without holiness—being made Christ-like. After the sermon, full liberty was given to question us, and we answered all that chose to ask; and there were several, which gave new interest to the subject.

While in Springfield we visited the grave of O. Scott, to whom we refer in our previous remarks. He *sleeps* in the Cemetery, near the Methodist Church. Near two years have passed away since he has "slept in the dust of the earth," awaiting "the voice of the archangel and the trump of God" to waken him to meet his descending Lord. Many reflections rushed upon our mind as we gazed upon the spot of earth where he lies whose warm hand we had often pressed—whose animating voice and countenance had often cheered us—by whose side we had often stood in doing battle against oppression—and who, first of all ministers of the Gospel, encouraged us to proclaim to the world our views of no immortality to wicked men. Our emotions, as as we stood by his grave, can be more easily imagined than described. We did not indeed fancy an immortal spirit fled to some imaginary heaven; but we did feel an oppression come over our mind that he with whom we were once so intimate in active life was now before us, but could not hear our voice, nor mingle his affections with ours. No, silence reigned: but *hope* was there; and that hope was in our heart that he who lay before us in the silent dust would, ere long, hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth to eternal life. We reluctantly took a last look of his dusty bed, and turning away, could scarce restrain our tears: it had a softening and chastening influence on our affections which still remains; and we shall often reflect upon that scene, and live in hope that we shall meet again where death is known no more.

From Springfield we travelled west to Albany, N. Y., the place where we first preached our "Six Sermons" in 1842. At Albany we now preached three times, and trust the Lord will bless the word spoken to the good of such as heard it. Our interview with old friends was of a refreshing character. Some, however, were scattered abroad, and some had fallen asleep. We here became acquainted with Eld. Jasper Hazen, Editor of the Christian Palladium, a periodical of the Christian connection; he is Editor also of the American Christian Messenger. We were refreshed by the kind and brotherly spirit he manifested towards us. We cannot but love men, who, though they differ from our views, manifest that they are in possession of a brotherly heart. "*Love* is the fulfilling of the law;" without this all our professions and knowledge are vain. Eld. Hazen was among our hearers while in Albany, and we feel a pleasure in the remembrance of our interview with him.

On our return to Philadelphia, we spent the first Sabbath in May in the city of New York, and preached three times in the American Hall; but the day was one of the most rainy of the season, so that few attended.

Now, after an absence of six weeks, we are once more at home in our "own hired house." Our Heavenly Father has kindly watched over us in our travels, so that no harm has befallen us in passing over near a thousand miles by steam power. He has brought us to our habitation in peace, and preserved ours in safety during the period of our absence; and we now desire to record His loving-kindness and tender mercy. To Him be glory and praise through Jesus Christ, His Son, our Saviour and Hope.

THE TRUE WESLEYAN—IMMORTALITY.

Since our last paper went to press, the Editor of the True Wesleyan has commenced a series of articles on "*The Immortality of the Soul.*" In the first article he stated the *reasons* for discussing the question, and the *conditions* on which replies would be admitted into the Wesleyan: one of those conditions was, if the respondent be an editor he shall publish both sides in his paper. We had a personal and friendly interview with the Editor of the Wesleyan, and an understanding that we were to republish in the Examiner no more of his articles than we might be disposed to reply to. With this arrangement we left our response to his article "No. 2," with him, on our way to Boston. Soon after we arrived at Boston we received a note from the Editor of the Wesleyan, saying that he had concluded to have his articles stereotyped, and make a book of them; and as such a work should contain a reply to all the objections urged against his views, and as those replies would most naturally arise out of his rejoinders to ours, he desired that we should first publish in the Examiner, and then he would copy from our paper and respond when through with his regular course of argument: this would enable him, with least expense, to stereotype his rejoinders to complete the book. We wrote him in reply, that we did not wish to oppose any obstacle in the way of his book being got up in the way most convenient to himself; but still, thought his new proposition would give him a *double* advantage: first, the influence of his entire argument would be on the minds of the readers of the Wesleyan before the first of my replies would appear; and then, second, each of my articles was to be accompanied with his rejoinder to prevent the minds of his readers from losing whatever impression his series of articles might have made: and besides, the time that would elapse from the time his articles were published to the appearance of mine, would make it necessary for

me to quote more from his than if they followed immediately. Under these considerations we requested him to return the article we left him, and now present our readers with his article from the Wesleyan, of March 24th, with our reply: it is as follows:

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.—NO. II.

THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL.

The Scriptures alone can certainly and satisfactorily settle the question before us, in the minds of christians, yet there may be arguments drawn from reason and philosophy which have much force; and as these may assist in coming at a right understanding of the Scriptures, we will commence with them, and close with a direct appeal to the Bible. We will commence with the spiritual nature of the soul. The soul or mind is not matter but spirit, and of course forms no part of the body. This raises an important issue with one class who deny the immortality of the soul. There are some who deny the existence of a soul or spirit in man, to be contradistinguished from the body, and insist that what we call the mind is a mere function of the brain, and that the brain itself is intelligent.

So far as the researches of philosophy extend, there are but two primary substances in the universe, and these are MATTER and SPIRIT. All we know of these substances is certain properties and phenomena which they exhibit. Matter is known to possess the properties of Impenetrability, Extension, Figure, Divisibility, Indestructibility, Inertia, Attraction. Spirit is that which thinks, perceives, remembers, reasons, wills, and is susceptible of love, hatred, joy and grief. The former of these properties are found in our bodies, in common with all other matter; the latter constitute the phenomena of the mind. It is not reasonable to suppose that properties so opposite to each other, inhere in the same substance, and the only rational conclusion is that matter is not mind, and that mind is not matter. There must therefore be in man an intelligent spirit, which forms no part of the body, and this is what we call the soul. We reason upon the modern and generally admitted principles of natural philosophy, and unless we are greatly mistaken, the whole system of philosophy will have to be exploded to invalidate our arguments.

The admitted properties of matter, and the admitted properties of mind, cannot inhere in, and be essential properties of the same substance. A few illustrations will make this plain. The body is matter, every part of it is matter; the bones are matter, the flesh is matter, the blood is matter. the nerves are matter, the brain is matter, and all the secretions are matter, every part is matter, and the whole is matter, and to every part and to the whole belong the properties of matter above described. Where these properties inhere, as they do in the body, the properties of mind cannot inhere.

Inertia, which is an essential property of matter, cannot inhere in the same substance with will or volition, which is an essential property of mind. Inertia is that property in matter which renders it incapable of self-motion, or self-action; matter acting only as it is acted upon: will or volition is that property of mind which renders it capable of self-determination and self-action. Now as matter can only act as it is acted upon, and as mind has the power of self-action, they cannot be the same substance,—matter cannot be mind, mind cannot be matter. Again, matter can only be moved by physical force; matter acts on matter by contact, and one material body cannot act on another material body, only as their surfaces come in contact; but mind is acted upon by motives, and acts from motives, and mind acts on mind through the medium of motives without physical contact. This proves as clear as a sun-beam that matter and mind are not the same.

To insist in opposition to the above view, that mind is matter; that intelligence and volition are its inherent properties, and consequently that man has no soul, which forms no part of his body, must subvert the admitted principles of philosophy. Philosophy insists that inertia is an essential property of matter; man's body is matter, as shown above, and yet it exhibits locomotive powers, and is seen acting without any visible agent acting upon it, and hence the doctrine of the inertia of matter must be given up, or we must admit that there is a rational soul inhabiting in the body, which controls it, moves it, and guides it. We see a steam engine in motion, and we know that the power of motion does not reside in any part of the machine; that it acts only as it is acted upon. We know that the steam propels it, but we know at the same time that the steam acts only as it is acted upon; that there is an intelligent, reasonable agent that directs the whole.

So with the body; it is an animal machine, the bones are studs and braces to support the frame, and are levers for the purpose of mechanical action; the muscles, by their contractions and distensions, operate on the bones and set the machinery in motion; but the muscles have no intelligence, or volition, and when the machine is in order, they are under the control of, and are guided by the mind. The foot or hand cannot will to move; the eye cannot will to open or shut. This our own consciousness proves. Let any man try to will with his foot or hand; and his own consciousness, which is the highest proof possible, will tell him that there is no power to will in his foot or hand. Man can will, and may be conscious of willing to move his foot, but at the same time he is conscious that his foot does not will, and that he does not will with his foot, but that he, his mind, wills concerning it. The muscles are put in motion by a power superior to themselves, which must be intelligent. Now what is this power? Those who deny that man has a soul, which is no part of the body, and which is an immaterial spirit, say that the brain is this self-determining, controlling and guiding power. This we deny on the ground that it is matter, and only matter, and possesses only the properties and powers of matter. If it be said that there is something in or associated with the brain which is not matter, which is superior to matter, the whole argument is given up, for that is just what we contend for, and that superior something which is not matter, we call the soul. If it be said that the brain is only matter, then however refined it may be, it possesses only the properties of matter, one of which is inertia, directly the reverse of self-operation. The brain then cannot act only as it is acted upon, and we come back to the question, what is this superior power that sets the muscles in motion, when we will to move the foot or the hand? If it now be said that it is the brain, we ask what power acts

upon the brain, causing it to act on the muscles? The brain being matter, can act only as acted upon. We have then got to give up the first principles of Natural Philosophy, or seek for some higher cause of the phenomenon of motion. We allow that the muscles operate on the bones, that the brain operates on the muscles, through the nerves, all the nerves and spinal marrow terminating in the brain; but we insist at the same time, that there is an intelligent soul which acts on the brain, or it would never act. This doctrine being admitted, the phenomena of matter and mind are made to harmonize without involving any philosophical contradiction, or absurdity; deny it, and the principles of natural philosophy, which past ages have developed and matured, are thrown back into chaos, and we have to begin, de novo, and grope our way in search of first principles.

The above view accords with our own consciousness. Every man is conscious of thinking, but we are not conscious of thinking with any part of our body, not even the brain. That the head is the seat of the intelligence, no rational man can doubt; we are conscious that the thinking operation is carried on within the head, but no man is conscious that his brains think. The rational soul is mysteriously united to the body, and the brain is doubtless the point of union, and constitutes the medium through which the soul holds communion with the physical world without. The fact that this union is mysterious constitutes no objection, for if we deny it, there will be as great a mystery involved in the idea that the whole mental phenomena is the result of properties inherent in matter, and found only in the brain, in contradistinction from all other matter.

Response to Article "No. II."

Br. Lee,—As you have kindly granted me the use of the Wesleyan to respond to your articles on Immortality, I hope to do you the justice to keep to the conditions you have specified in your last number; and I earnestly pray that the Father of Lights may give us both understanding, and guide us into truth. Whatever may be the result of our controversy, I truly desire that we may be able so to conduct it as to show that we can, *if we must*, differ in love.

The philosophical part of the question interests me but little, and hence, upon that part, I shall probably say but little. I perfectly agree with you that "the Scriptures alone can settle the question before us." The *facts* of inspiration must determine what is the constitution of man. Philosophers have never yet come to an agreement among themselves on this subject; and their speculations may well be termed "legion." Their imaginings have mainly grown out of the notion that there are "*two substances*;" though in that they were not always agreed. Bishop Berkly, it seems, adopted the notion which amounts to this, *viz*: "*matter does not exist*." Berkly, indeed, calls man *a substance*, but then he is an *incorporeal substance*. He, and Plato before him, regarded motion and intellect as real and independent existences, and not as qualities of matter; this doubtless led him to his conclusion as to the non-existence of matter, inasmuch as we see neither motion nor intellect except in connection with matter. Locke declares, we do not know *what matter is*; and endeavors to prove from this fact, that we do know what *im*material substance is! Truly, "the world by wisdom knew not" man, any more than it did "God."

The Double Substance theory is that from which you reason on the question under discussion. So far as I am concerned, I wish it understood that what constitutes the being of God does not enter into this controversy. We agree "that he is;" but *what* He is, beyond the fact that He is Spirit, I shall not attempt to define. Whatever He is, it proves nothing as to what man is.

You tell us, "so far as the researches of philosophy extend, there are but two primary substances in the universe, and these are matter and spirit." The term "primary" implies secondary "substances" What are these? Are they neither matter nor spirit? Among your definitions of matter is "indestructibility; but you say "every part of the body is matter." Do you really believe "every part of the body" is "indestructible?"

Again, are electricity and light matter? and do they possess the property of "inertia?" "The whole system of philosophy" is "exploded" if the properties of matter, as you have defined them, pertain not to these.

"Inertia, which is an essential property of matter," you tell us, "cannot inhere in the same substance with will or volition, which is an essential property of mind." But, is it not a fact, that the mind "inheres" in the "brain," which, you say, is "matter?" and hence, is it not a fact, that mind, will and volition, "inhere" in matter?

You say again—"Inertia is that property in matter which renders it incapable of self-motion, or self-action," &c. Is this true of light, of magnetism, and electricity? If not, does not your argument fail?

It appears to me that you have given the properties of what philosophers term "*inanimate* matter," and not matter organized, or living matter; and hence I think you do not reason conclusively on this point.

If light, magnetism, and electricity be spirit, and not matter, then "attraction" is not only the property of matter, but mind, or spirit also. "Matter," you say, "can be moved only by physical force." But the muscles move, or contract and expand, it is said, by nervous power. Do the nerves exert a physical force? If so, what sends the electric current along the nerves? Do you say, "it is the will." If so, as "matter can be moved *only* by physical force," must not the *will* be physical? that is, must it not be matter?

Once more, you say—"Matter acts on matter by contact, and one material body has no power to act on another material body, *only* as their surfaces come in contact." But, does not matter act on matter without *contact of surface*? The sun, millions of miles from the earth, acts with tremendous "force" on it. And do not all the planets act on one another without contact? According to the philosophy upon which you base your argument, mind can do no more. "This proves," if not as "clear as a sun beam," yet, clear enough, "that matter and mind are" modifications of "the same," Br. Lee being judge: and thus you "subvert the admitted principles of philosophy." Does "philosophy insist that inertia is an essential principle of" *organized* "matter?" If so, it is false philosophy.

Br. Lee says, "We are not conscious of think-

ing with the brain." Are we conscious of thinking *without* our brain? For my part, I am just as conscious of thinking with my brain as of seeing with my eyes; or, as I am conscious of walking with my legs. But suppose I had not that consciousness, would that any more prove I did not think with my brain, than it would prove my stomach did not digest my food because I am not conscious of that? The brain, by excessive study, becomes fatigued and pained; and we are conscious of using our brain when we think; and when it becomes affected by disease, we feel an inability to think.

We again repeat, that the darkness philosophy has thrown over this subject, arises from the Double Substance theory; and this principle is in opposition to the relation in Genesis, where God is considered, not as an immaterial substance, but simply as an "ETERNAL BEING, who by his will *condensated that which constitutes heaven and earth*, and communicates to matter, motion and life." No philosopher has ever been able to give even a tolerable definition of his fancied "*immaterial substance*:" the expression itself is without meaning, and an evident contradiction of ideas; and since the idea of *substance* contains the idea of *matter*, ought not the expression "immaterial substance" to be rejected from Philosophy?

In conclusion,—If the philosophy upon which your reasoning is founded be true, that "inertia is that property in matter which renders it *incapable* of self-motion or self-exertion;" and, in order to these manifestations, there must be added "spirit," or an immaterial substance, without which "self-determination and self-action" would be *impossible;* then, does it not follow, that all animals, birds, reptiles, insects, fishes, and the smallest animalculæ, possess "spirit," or the immaterial substance, as *really* as man? for they all are "capable of self-motion, or self-exertion." Shall we not rather conclude that the Infinite, Eternal, and Self-existent Being, who is the Creator of all things, has *power* to *organize* matter so as to impart to it life, and endow it with "self-determination and self-action," without the fancied immaterial substance?

Yours truly, in the Gospel of Christ, with much esteem,

GEORGE STORRS.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., March 27th, 1849.

FUTURE STATES.

By REV. REGINALD COURTENAY, A. M.

(Continued from page 62.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

Let us now turn to St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. "The trumpet shall sound, the dead shall be raised incorruptible; this mortal shall assume immortality. *Then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy sting, O HADES, where is thy victory!" Here the apostle exults over Hades and Death together, because God, he knew, would on his appointed day rescue the souls of men from their dark dominion; and make an utter end of those evil powers, who, in the strength of sin, had reigned for a time over mankind. And it would appear from his language that the victory of Hades over the soul is as complete as that of death. But if there be an intermediate consciousness, and for the redeemed an interval of most blissful rest, *Hades has no victory at all.* Death may conquer the body, but Hades, so far from subduing the soul, would actually liberate it from a heavy burden and bondage, and promote "the glorious liberty of the children of God." St. Paul however declares that Death and Hades now reign together: nevertheless, knowing that they shall hereafter be cast together into the "lake of fire," and that an interval of death and unconsciousness, to be terminated on the last Day, is but a momentary decease, and scarcely to be regarded as an evil, he anticipates the final triumph, and exults over them as already subdued. For Hades may be deemed to have no captives, unless she can bind them in everlasting chains.

Departing saints are sometimes known to triumph, in the hour of dissolution, as if their victory were already won. And Christians who "have fought the good fight" are certainly not forbidden thus to triumph, although it be not till the Last Day that Death is swallowed up in victory. For the interval will not be felt; no train of thought will disturb the deep sleep of the dead, sickening the soul with hope deferred: but they shall find that Scripture realised to them, "It is appointed unto men once to die;—and after this the *judgment.*"

Death and Hades however are still permitted to reign; and are destined to exert their destroying power till the end of the world. At the opening of the "fourth seal," in the Apocalypse, St. John "Beheld a pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and *Hades* followed with him. And power was given to them over the fourth part of the earth, to *kill* with sword and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth." Here is Hades painted as one going forth to devour and destroy, in league with death. In the same book they are again coupled together, in their present subjection to the Son of Man, and in their final fate. "He hath the keys of Hades and Death," to unlock their dark gates on the predestined day; and when he executes the judgments committed to him, they shall be together cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death," and be themselves destroyed. Shortly before this, in the vision of St. John, the "sea gave up the dead that were in it, and Death and *Hades* (the supposed abode of *living* souls) delivered up the *dead* which were in them."

Still more numerous are the passages of the Old Testament, wherein death and Hell,—in the Hebrew Sheol, in the Greek Hades,—are mentioned together, not as if Hades were a pleasant place of refuge for the disembodied souls, the victims of death, but as if the two were conjoined in the work of destruction. See Job xxvi. 6. Prov. xv. 11, xxvii. 20. Hab. ii. 5.

It cannot be pretended that Hades is the place or state of the body merely—or indeed of the body at all. While the body moulders into dust and is scattered to the four winds, the soul is in Hades. "Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in Hades, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption," was David's prophecy concerning Christ. If in any passage of Scripture the body should seem to be in Hades, it is because a locality is given to Hades which does not in strictness belong to it; and it is then placed *in the grave.* Thought can have no locality: "one might as well say of a disembodied spirit that it is hard or heavy; or a cubic foot in dimensions, as to say that it is here or there." Hades has no more

locality than has Death; though both are in Scripture occasionally localized, or personified. But because the body descends into the grave, and will rise again from the grave, the man, body, and soul, is said to do the same. "All men shall rise again, *with* their bodies;" and before resurrection the dead are said to "dwell *in dust*;" to "sleep *in the dust of the earth*." Yet it is plain, that the instant that mysterious tie is severed which connects the body and soul, all that gave locality to mind is wholly lost. When therefore it is said, that on the return of the body to the dust, "the spirit returns to God who gave it," we ought not to imagine, as some do, an ascent of the spirit towards the skies; but simply an assertion of the fact, that the spirit, which when given by the Creator, and detached, as it were, from Him, constituted a living creature, has now reverted back to him who gave it, and become, not by change of *place*, but of *ownership*, His property again.

Our Lord declared that as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should he himself be three days and nights in *the heart of the earth*. Here the *heart* of the earth is simply put in opposition to the belly of the whale, and the words do not differ essentially from those of the more usual prediction that our Lord should be three days in *the grave*. We read also that our Lord "descended into *the lower parts of the earth*." But no stress can be laid on this, inasmuch as it is not evident that *the earth itself* is not intended, which in comparison of heaven is termed, *the lower* (parts or regions.) *ta katotera tes ges:* as where Isaiah says, "Sing, O ye heavens; shout, ye lower parts of the earth."*

The mention that is occasionally made in Scripture of an abyss, deep or bottomless pit, as the abode of certain spirits, and of the soul of Christ during its separation from the body, deserves consideration in relation to this point. This abyss appears to be the same as Hades, and to be a place wherein spirits are *confined*. Hence proceeded the locusts of the Apocalypse, and perhaps also Apollyon their king, and hence also the beast, on whom sat the Babylonish idolatress. It is probably a place of confinement for spirits, wherein they are prevented from all exercise of their powers. "I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand, and he laid hold on * * Satan and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut him up and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more." And it is the same as Hades, for this fate of Satan seems to be precisely that of the rebellious angels of St. Peter and St. Jude. Moreover we know that our Lord descended into Hades; and St. Paul writes, "who shall descend into the deep,—the *abyss*—that is, to bring up Christ from the dead" That it is a place of confinement would appear also from the intreaty of the Legion of demons to our Lord, that he would allow them to go into the herd of swine, and not command them into the abyss. Now the confinement of a spirit seems to be the same as the destruction of all his consciousness; if the mind be reduced to inactivity, all its thoughts perish, activity being of the very essence of *thought*.* But this imprisonment in Hades, whether of the human soul, or of an evil spirit, need not be local, inasmuch as thought is not local. Strictly speaking, the spirit or soul or life of man neither moves upwards to God and heaven nor downwards to the grave. The union of mind with matter alone can give locality; and it is this union imagined or foreseen, that has occasioned those Scriptural expressions—to "dwell in the dust,"—to "rise again with their bodies."† But these expressions would not have been used, this union during the intermediate state would not have been supposed, unless the condition of the disembodied soul harmonized with that of the body, so that when the one was buried, the other also could be said to sleep, and to be in "a land of darkness."

Again, we may learn something concerning Hades, from the fact that our blessed Lord himself descended into it, and on the third day rose again *from the dead*. It is evident from Scripture, that the death which our Lord endured did not wholly terminate with his passion on the cross. God raised him up, "having *loosed the pains of death*, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." And the heart of Christ was to rejoice, and his flesh to rest in hope, *because* the Father would not 'leave his soul in Hades, nor suffer His Holy, One to see corruption." Now inasmuch as it was an infinite condescension in our Lord to take upon him our nature, and subject himself to the burden of the flesh, what were THE PAINS OF DEATH to him, what the triumph of his resurrection, if death had merely relieved him of the burden of the flesh, and enabled his liberated soul to pass into rest and glory? How was corruption obviated by his reassumption of that body of flesh which he had laid down on the Cross? Some are accustomed to say, that the glory of the resurrection of the saints at the Last Day will mainly consist in the investiture of their souls with glorified, spiritual bodies. But Christ took again the body in which he suffered. Again, "Christ being risen from the dead, it is said, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Death then had dominion over him, *until* he "rose again from the dead." But for this resurrection the Holy One would, like David, have seen corruption; corruption would have had dominion not over a mere frame of flesh, but over that holy soul in which was no sin. Christ laid down on the cross all that life, which his Incarnation and Nativity had given him,—his human body and soul. "I lay down MY LIFE: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."

And what signify those sublime words, "I am he that liveth, and *was dead*, and behold I am alive for evermore."‡ And, "In that he died, he

* Ephes. iv. 9. Isaiah xliv. 23. St. Paul, it may be observed, is speaking of Christ's ascension from the earth, not his resurrection from the dead.

* Thus in Rev. xvii. 8, it is written, "The beast which thou sawest was, and *is not*, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition." Now if by perdition is meant everlasting punishment in the lake of fire, everlasting consciousness, it would seem that there is no consciousness till the beast passes from the abyss, and goes into perdition. The expression, "is not," may however merely signify, "is no longer upon earth."

† And to that remarkable passage above quoted—"Many bodies of the sleeping saints, (*recumbent, reclining saints,*) arose, and came out of their graves."

‡ Rev. i. 18. "I am the living one, and I became one-that-is-dead, and behold I am living for ever."

died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Shall we make them mean, "I lay down my body; I have power to lay it down, and resume it." "I am he that am embodied, and was disembodied, and behold I am embodied for evermore." "In that he parted with his body, he died unto sin once, but in that he hath it again, he liveth unto God." Rather we should believe, that our blessed Lord parted with his human soul; parted with *that life itself, whereby* he now liveth. If his resurrection from the dead had been merely the taking his body again, it would have been no more a victory over death, than was his incarnation; or at least no more than was the creation of Adam from the lifeless dust of the ground. But Hades grasped a human soul; and that was wrenched from her dark dominion.

And so glorious was this victory over Hades, that in reference to this Christ is spoken of as the Son of God. He is termed "the first begotten from the dead," he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead;" and we are told that "God hath fulfilled his promises of mercy, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'" Thus also, "they who are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more, and are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection:" and are said to "groan within themselves, waiting for *the adoption*,—to wit, the redemption of the body;" for "the manifestation of the Sons of God."

Had the victory been gained on the cross, our Lord's last words would have been those of exultation; sounds of joy and triumph would have filled the heavens, as at the nativity; and angels would have bidden the disciples to weep no more, cheering them as they did on the third day. And the bodies of the saints which slept need not have been detained in their graves until after his resurrection; but at once appearing unto many, might have testified to the subjugation of death.

Some persons are inclined to believe, that our Lord, when he entered the realms of Hades, entered as a conqueror; bringing into these desolate shades a light and life not their own; nay, proclaiming in them that gospel which his apostles afterwards preached on earth. They refer to the words of St. Peter,—"Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; by the which also he went and *preached unto the spirits in prison*, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." But all that St. Peter asserts is, that our Lord preached to the spirits in prison *by the same spirit* by which he was quickened; not by any means that he preached while he was numbered among the dead. And indeed, if there be meaning in words, the quick are not to be confounded with the dead; but to be "quickened" is to be raised again from the dead; which happened to our Lord not on the cross, but on the third day after his crucifixion. *Then* it was that the quickening spirit of immortal life, which utterly abhors and is incompatible with the state of death, visited and reanimated his mortal soul.

Let us consider too by what means Christ triumphed over death. Even by first submitting to death. He "tasted death for every man;" and "through death subdued him that had the power of death." He drank this bitter cup, and drained its very dregs, that the vials of wrath might not be poured out upon guilty men. Whatever gloom then there was in Hades before the advent of Christ, into that gloom he entered; whatever were the "pains of death" for the worst of sinners, those pains he underwent; nay, whatever *would have been* the utmost tyranny of Hades and Death over men, but for his mediation, to that Christ for a time succumbed. By no less a sacrifice could he have accomplished his great design of subduing death, by first submitting to death.* To suppose that the grave was a more lightsome place to him than it is, or would have been, to the worst of sinners, is to forget the price which was paid for redemption; and to leave room for the conscience-stricken sinner to dread lest he should be excluded from the benefits of the resurrection, since so dark a death as *his* had not been undergone by the Saviour. By first enduring all, Christ overcame all. Not in descending into the abyss, but in ascending up on high, he led captivity captive. Hades did not acknowledge him as a conqueror till on the third day he broke her bonds asunder, and cast away her cords from him; and mounted his eternal throne on "the holy hill of Sion."

No more inappropriate season for preaching could possibly be imagined, than that which is arbitrarily chosen for the publication of the gospel to the "imprisoned spirits." That they were in Hades at the time we have indeed ample reason to believe; but they were then as it were in the condemned cells, beyond the reach of reprieve, and waiting till they should be summoned from the bottomless pit, to go into perdition.

The doctrine of redemption through Christ's suffering of death, as well as the express language of the New Testament concerning Hades, confirms that testimony of the Jewish Scriptures which makes of Hades a land of darkness, and where all things are forgotten; a place wherein (while "the living know that they shall die") the dead "know not any thing." Spirits condemned and under confinement,—the souls of men while subject to the dominion of death,—and the proud city that was to sink to utter ruin and desolation, are alike said to be cast down to Hades, because they are all alike subjected to the Power of Destruction, have gone into darkness, silence, and death; and have become as though *they were not*. But still their souls are safe, still they live unto God, who have died in faith; even in the faith of Abraham, whose belief was "*in God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were.*"

[We by no means endorse every expression in the foregoing article, though the general view is correct. ED. EXAMINER.]

* The death to which Adam became liable through his transgression is said to be temporal, spiritual, and *eternal*, the latter being sometimes held to include the suffering of eternal fire. But erroneously, for not only is the latter punishment a consequence of *resurrection unto damnation*, not of death; but, had this been a part of the original curse, our Lord, we may venture to believe, must have descended into the flames of Gehenna itself, in order to rescue man, by "tasting of death for him."

INTERESTING FOREIGN ITEMS.

ROME.—THE INTERVENTION AND ITS TERMS.

Letters from Florence of the 10th inst. state that a French steamer from Gaëta had landed the Secretary of the French Legation at Rome at Civita Vecchia, and that he had immediately left for the capital. He was said to be the bearer of the ultimatum of the foreign powers for the reëstablishment of the Pope. It appears that a simultaneous movement has been arranged between the powers; the French were to occupy Civita Vecchia, and Ancona; the Austrians, Ferrara; the Neapolitans, the frontier. On the arrival of the steamer from Gaëta, another steamer was immediately dispatched to Toulon with orders, it was said, to embark the expeditionary force. Civita Vecchia was being fortified.

The *Positivo* of Rome states that the following are some of the terms imposed by France and England on the Pope as the conditions on which they will aid his return to Rome: A general annesty, a complete secular Government, inviolability of political liberty, abolition of the holy office and ecclesiastical tribunals except in the matter of the Clergy, and the suppression of proprietary religious orders.

SECRETS OF THE INQUISITION.

The correspondent of the *Daily News* describes a visit he had paid to the many small, dark, and damp dungeons of the Inquisition. The building is out of the beaten track, being in a sort of cul de sac behind St. Peter's. The dungeons, and all their apparatus, are to be thrown open to the inspection of the public, and will furnish a sight not likely to recommend priestly rule to the people. The correspondent says: The officer in charge led me down to where the men were digging in the vaults below; they had cleared a downward flight of steps, which was choked up with old rubbish, and had come to a series of dungeons under the vaults deeper still, and which immediately brought to my mind the prisons of the Doge under the canal of the Bridge of Sighs at Venice, only that here there was a surpassing horror.

I saw imbedded in old masonry, unsymmetrically arranged, five skeletons in various recesses, and the clearance had only just begun; the period of their insertion in this spot must have been more than a century and a half. From another vault full of sculls and scattered human remains there was a shaft about four feet square ascending perpendicularly to the first floor of the building, and ending in a passage off the hall of the chancery, where a trap-door lay between the tribunal and the way into a suite of rooms destined for one of the officials. The object of this shaft could admit of but one surmise. The ground of the vault was made up of decayed animal matter, a lump of which held imbedded in it a long silken lock of hair, as I found by personal examination as it was shovelled up from below. But that is not all: there are two large subterranean lime-kilns, if I may so call them, shaped like a beehive in masonry, filled with layers of calcined bones, forming the substratum of two other chambers on the ground-floor in the immediate vicinity of the very mysterious shaft above mentioned."—[It must be remembered that of late the power of the Holy Inquisition, even in Rome, was greatly fallen from its former high estate.]

BR. ELON EVERTS, Vergennes, Vt., writes:

BR. STORRS:—The Examiner is what the community here need. I am glad to see that such honest hearted, bold, influential men as Elder Bates and Hand are investigating the doctrines advocated in your paper. I am glad that Br. Walsh has no mean competitor. Mr. Brewster will probably mount the highest rampart, and ply the largest guns that his side can afford, but when his bulwark falls, (for error can't stand) it seems that the way will be cleared for him to join the victors, and lead on the host that has been shielding themselves behind the same untempered mortared wall. Truth is mighty and it will prevail.

Yours in Christian bonds.

BR. N. M. CATLIN, Kingsbury, Ind., writes:

BR. STORRS:—The Truth is spreading in these parts: people are investigating. I have disposed of all the "Six Sermons" which I ordered a short time since. I shall, I think, soon order more, and thus help spread the light of truth.

THE NEW WORK.—"*The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by H. H. DOBNEY," Baptist Minister, England, is the very best work on the End of the Wicked we have ever seen. It is written in the kindest spirit, and cannot give offence to any. Though kind, it is clear, uncompromising and overwhelming against the popular theory of natural immortality and endless misery; and demonstrating, so far as argument can do it, that *utter destruction* is the punishment of wicked and unrepenting men. Put this work into the hands of all who will read, not forgetting ministers of all sects and parties. It contains 286 pages, 12mo. Price 75 cts. bound, or 50 in paper covers; this last, only, can be sent by mail. For *each* dollar, current money, sent us free of expense, we will send *two* copies of it and *pre-pay* the postage on them; or, we will send *three* without pre-paying the postage where the Post Masters will allow them to be thus sent. Since the notice we published in the Advent Harbinger, we find that the Post Offices are not uniform in requiring the postage to be *pre*-paid. In New York City they demanded it, and would not forward them without; but, we find, on our return home, that the Post Office in Philadelphia makes no such demand; so that *we* can do it or not, as those who order the work may desire.

One-third discount will be made to those who purchase six or more copies, if current money is sent us. Cash, always, with the order.

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in Boston, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 87 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store; Lowell, Mass., of Eld. M. Bates, Chapel St., one door above Elm; Albany, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, No. 8 Commercial Buildings; New York City, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.; Rochester, N. Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

All orders sent us, at Philadelphia, Pa., for Dobney, to be forwarded by *Express*, will be sent to New York City, without expense, going north, east or west.

Our "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh Eld. Bates, Geo. T. Adams, and Dr. Bundell.

BUSINESS NOTICES.—Elon Everts. We have sent C. W. Sperry's paper regularly to Bristol, Vt., this year. We now send also to "Charles Sperry, Panton, Vt.," as you request. Shall we continue to send to both names? We shall, unless you direct otherwise.

James F. Compton. The "five dollars" your letter purports to contain is not received. Post Master says there is no help for us. The papers and 40 copies of Six Sermons, 18mo., are sent same as if we had received the money.

S. A. Chaplin. All the papers and Sermons have been sent as you desired, and also 8 copies Six Sermons, 18mo, to you.

Eli Cross. We should have paid the postage on the first that you ordered of Dobney--by mistake it was neglected--it is paid on the last. Charge us with the first

Dr. M. Helm. We have sent you twelve copies of Dobney.

James Carless. Books sent as directed: one-third discount on them: $1.32 still due you.

James Donaldson. Four of Dobney's work were sent you in our absence; we have sent another copy since our return.

If any errors have occurred in answering orders in our absence, send us word, at our expense, and we will make all right.

☞ The Examiner for June will not go to press till the middle of that month.

☞ Our Hymn Book is not yet published; we have not the means to do it. E. Miller, Jr., pledges to take 75 copies. Who next?

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1849. No. 6.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

TRUE WESLEYAN—IMMORTALITY.

A REVIEW, BY DR. J. T. WALSH.

No. I.

At the request of a friend, I undertake to review the *philosophical* part of Mr. Lee's argument in favour of *natural immortality*. I desire the reader to consider this article as a continuation of Br. Storrs' argument, in reply to Mr. Lee's "No. 2," which appeared in the last Examiner. I shall also review Mr. Lee's Scriptural argument, although I consider that my friend Mr. Brewster has managed that part of the subject as well as any one can do it. I expect nothing more conclusive from Mr. Lee; and, indeed, there is nothing new in his *philosophical* argument; and, if left to my choice, I should pass *it* in silence; but as some of my friends think a review necessary, at their suggestion I write. And now to the argument:

1. Mr. Lee proceeds to give us the properties of matter, and all he says about the essential properties of matter, is just as applicable to a stone as to any part of the human body. He gives us the essential properties of *inanimate matter*, and finding no consciousness, no resaon, no intelligence in this, he rushes to the illogical and unphilosophical conclusion, that *organized living matter* cannot think! This foundation—his starting point, is wrong, and his superstructure worthless. The question is, not whether a *stone* can think, but whether a *living man*, organized from the elements of nature, *thinks by his brain*. When Mr. Lee has proved that *thought* is not an *essential* property of matter, he has gained nothing. I can prove that *sound* is not an *essential* property of a musical instrument, but what will that prove? Will it prove that the harmony of sounds is not dependant upon the *organization* of the *wind* (or other musical) instrument? Take the *wood* of which an instrument is made, and there is no music in it. Let it be *organized*, and yet there is no music. What is the reason? Why music is not an essential property of *wood*; this is *matter*, and there is no music in matter; what is wanting now to produce the "concord of sweet sounds?" We must have the atmosphere, for where there is no atmosphere sound cannot be produced. But the *atmosphere* is *matter*, and there is no music in matter? Ah, says Mr. Lee, an *intelligent mind* is necessary to the production of sound. Yes; but there is no music in the mind. The mind has the power of producing what is not an *essential* property of itself. And it has the faculty of appreciating the harmony of sounds produced. Now for the application of this illustration: There is no sound, or harmony of sounds, in an *instrument*, none in the *atmosphere*, and none in the *mind*; but, by combining the *three* we have what was not in either *separately*. So, there may be no thought, no reason, no intelligence in *inanimate matter*; but when that matter is *organized*, as we see it in man, who will affirm it cannot manifest *thought*? But it may be objected that, in the case supposed, there is an intelligent mind operating upon the instrument and the atmosphere, producing the result.

Let us take another, then; and we will suppose the case of a *watch*. There is no *time* in the materials of which a watch is made; and, yet, when *organized* by an intelligent mind, it will indicate the hour, minute, and second. The maker winds it up, and it continues to perform its *functions* until it runs down. So with man; there may be no reason, or thought in the component parts of his constitution separately considered; but when *organized*, and put in motion by the spirit of life in the atmosphere, breathed into his nostrils by his Maker, he awakes to consciousness, to thought and reason.

Mr. Lee has not to be informed, I trust, that by combining, chemically combining, two substances, a *third* can be produced, possessing none of the properties of the two elements used. He has not to be informed, I hope, that man is chemically formed or organized; and that the light of analogy makes it highly probable, to say the least of it, that matter, thus chemically combined, is capable of manifesting mental functions.

2. Mr. Lee makes "indestructibility," an essential property of matter; perhaps he means *annihilation;* for "indestructibility" is certainly not a property of matter.

One word as to what Mr. Lee and other natural philosophers term the essential properties of matter. It must be evident to those who reflect, that philosophers have only given us the essential properties of *some forms* of matter; for *Inertia* is certainly not an essential property of *all matter.* We have no evidence that inertia is an essential property of light; on the contrary light seems to be self-moving and ever-acting. This is true of caloric, galvanism, electricity, and magnetism. May it not be true, in a much higher sense, of the *aura* that pervades the brain and nerves?

One word as to the use of terms. The word *nature* embraces all created things, animate and inanimate. Thus we have organized and unorganized nature. The organized is again divided into the vegetable and animal. Matter is nowhere in the scriptures, contrasted, or put in opposition to spirit. Spirit is not the antithesis of matter. *Animal* stands opposed to *spirit*. We use the term matter as expressive of that which is tangible, or

of which the senses take cognizance. But matter exists in ten thousand forms, and is capable of almost endless combinations and sublimations. The term spirit, when used in relation to the *wind*, to *man*, and to *angels*, seems to express different modifications of matter. The word *immaterial—not material, not matter*, does not appear to be applicable to any thing in the universe. But, for the sake of argument, let us suppose that there is an *immaterial thing* in existence; how will you prove it? You cannot *see* it, for if you can see it, it is no longer *im*-material. You cannot smell it, nor hear it, nor feel it; it is not tangible to any of the senses; how, then, will you define it? The fact is, that which is immaterial has a name but no local habitation.

Matter may be regarded as embracing all that God has created, but under this generic term we have various orders, classes and species of matter; thus we have matter in its *simple*, or *elementary* form, then in its *compound* form, without regard to chemical affinity; then we have it chemically constituted, without relation to life; then in its *organized* form, in relation to vitality, as seen in the vegetable kingdom, and in the lowest orders of animalculæ; then in its more refined and exalted form as we see it in the human constitution; and lastly, in its highest degree of refinement and sublimation, called spirit, of which the angelic nature is a specimen. God is alike the creator of all forms of matter; or, if Mr. Lee likes it better, he is the creator of matter and spirit; and why should we affirm intelligence of one and not of the other? How does Mr. Lee know that volition is an *essential* property of spirit? The fact is, he assumes this, and then argues that gross matter, no matter how organized, cannot think. If God has created beings purely spiritual, they must have been created *before* they were endowed with consciousness, volition and thought; and therefore thought, &c., would not be an *essential* property of spirit. Mr. Lee does not know the essential properties of all matter, and therefore cannot affirm that thought is not an essential property of *some forms* of matter. God who formed matter, can make of it what He wills to make; He can combine, refine and organize it in a thousand proportions and forms, with a view of its manifesting as many functions. From the same original elements of matter He can make a thousand different kinds of fruit—the orange, the apple, the pear, the cherry, &c., &c. Yet these are all matter, but how different their qualities? And as is the organization, so is the quality of the fruits whether of acidity or sweetness.

And so it is in the animal world. Out of matter God makes bones, muscles, ligaments, nerves of motion, nerves of sensation, arteries, veins, glands, &c. Here we have matter in various forms, and each form has its own peculiar function, which it possesses in virtue of its organization. The man, therefore who affirms that matter in none of its forms can think, neither understands what he says, nor whereof he affirms. I shall return to this question in my next article.

A Review by J. T. Walsh.—No. II.

Mr. Lee says —"If matter can think, thought must be an essential property of matter, or it must be the result of some peculiar modification of matter; neither of which can be maintained. If thought be an essential property of matter, every part and particle of matter must think. If thought be essential to matter, what does not think is not matter."

Mr. Lee's logical powers fail him here, for it does not follow "if matter can think," that "thought must be an *essential* property of matter." The "*essential* property" of a thing is that "property" without which it cannot exist. Both matter and spirit can exist without thought, consequently thought is not an essential property of either. It is possible, however, for "thought to be the *result* of some peculiar modification of matter." But what sort of reasoning is this? "If thought be essential to matter, what does not think is not matter!" We might as well argue thus:

Inertia is an essential property of matter.

And that which does not possess this property is not matter.

But light, electricity, &c., do not possess inertia.

Therefore they are not matter.

Thus according to the received principles of natural philosophy, we see that light, &c., is not matter; it must, therefore, be spirit, and consequently intelligent; for Mr. Lee holds thought, &c., to be an essential property of spirit; and then, according to his own mode of reasoning, "if thought be an essential property of" spirit, "every part and particle of" spirit "must think!" Thus his whole theory, when exhibited in the light of reason, vanishes into thin air.

Mr. Lee asks the question—"Is thought the result of some modification (of) matter?" His whole reasoning on this question amounts to this—*that matter cannot think, because it is matter*! This is the alpha and omega of his argument. Now, I ask Mr. Lee, what are the *attributes* of *organized matter*, in its various modifications? He answers—"Indestructibility, Divisibility, Impenetrability, Inertia," &c. This is not the whole answer; it does not meet the case. And the question recurs—what are the properties of matter? Now, in order to meet this question fully, let us state a few principles. And,

1st. Spirit is defined to be that which has the power of self-motion, volition, consciousness, thought, reason, and intelligence. And,

2d. Matter is defined as above. (See indestructibility, &c.) Now, we affirm that the true answer is not given in either case. Let us see. Here are four nerves: the function of one is to transmit sounds; the function of another is to transmit light; the function of another is to transmit odours, and the function of another is to transmit the sensation of taste. These nerves are matter, yet they have different properties. One will transmit sounds, but will not and cannot transmit light. This proves that matter may be so organized as to possess different functions. This is true not only of sound and sight, but of taste and smell. Here are two nerves; the one a nerve of motion, and the other a nerve of sensation. They have different functions, but they are both matter. In all this there is no addition to matter, nor subtraction from matter; but matter, by being modified in its organization, develops new properties and functions. There is no infidelity or atheism in this philosophy, for we maintain that matter only possesses those properties with which God has endowed it. Mr. Lee's argument, on this point, is all lost. Man is not God, and therefore it is presumption to argue

from the nature of one to the nature of the other. The *nature* of God is *unorganized*, while the nature of all other beings is *organic*. This fact proves them to be material.

But let us come to the point more closely. It is admitted that man thinks, feels, and acts; but how does he do this? Mr. Lee says, "By his rational soul." That is, by his spirit or mind. Now, what are the functions or faculties of man? Let us look at them: Here is amativeness, or the sexual feeling. But this, according to Mr. Lee's philosophy, is not an essential property of matter; and therefore it belongs to the spirit or "rational soul." Here then we have mind, immateriality, immortality, desiring sexual intercourse. But, then, this function is not confined to man, but the whole animal world possesses the same. They, therefore, have the same "rational soul." Mr. Lee, perhaps, may say this is mere instinct. Very well, is *instinct* a property of *matter*? Here you are stranded again! Take another human faculty —love of offspring. Is this a function of matter, or spirit? Of matter it cannot be, according to Mr. Lee's theory; therefore it must be of spirit: so we have the "immortal spirit" exercising the parental function! And the beasts have the same faculty, therefore they have the same spirit!

Take another case. Man has the faculty of love, combativeness, destructiveness, love of gain, &c. &c. Are these functions of matter or spirit! Of matter they cannot be, according to Mr. Lee's theory; therefore they must be properties of spirit; and thus we have the "immaterial spirit" in love with human flesh, quarrelling, disputing, destroying, seeking gain, &c. &c.

But it may be said that the animal propensities are not attributes of the spirit; then, pray, of what are they attributes? Of matter? This would be fatal to your whole theory! For love, anger, sexual feeling, and the love of gain are not among your "essential properties of matter."

But if man possess an immortal mind, which is the seat of *all* the *affections*, *moral* and *mental* powers, of what use is the body? of what use is matter? of what use are the five senses? of what use is the brain? Just none at all! According to Mr. Lee's philosophy, a man is just as perfect without matter as with it; and, in fact, *more* perfect:—more perfect in the *ratio* that spirit is superior to matter! Of what use are impenetrability, divisibility, inertia, &c., in the economy of man? Matter is of no account. These are its only properties! away with it, it is not fit to live! yea, it does not, and cannot live! Man can live, and think, and reason; love, be amative, desire gain, hate and destroy without it! Certainly God degraded Himself by making anything out of it! Why did He create it? Why don't He annihilate it? Mr. Lee's hand and pen, which he uses in advocating error, are made of it. His mouth and organs of voice, which he uses in speaking, are made of it. What a pity! His Bible is made of matter, the baptismal element is matter, his paper is matter, his eyes are matter, his ears, his nose, his palate, his nerves, his lungs—they are all matter, *merely* possessing impenetrability, inertia, &c.! Of what account are they? Surely it was a work of supererrogation to create them! The steam he uses in printing is matter, the locomotive is propelled by matter, the magnetic wire is matter, the electric fluid is matter! All is matter!

But, if man be in possession of immortality, he inherits it. And Mr. Lee says—"matter can only act as it is acted upon." Now look at the *laws of generation*. Here we have matter acting upon matter, producing what? Transmitting what? "Immateriality," says Mr. Lee. That which is *material* can give birth, then, to that which is *immaterial*! Matter can produce that which is *not matter*. 'But,' will Mr. Lee say, 'the mind begets mind—spirit begets spirit?' Then it has "divisibility" which is a property of matter? Man has the power of transmitting the elements of his own organization, and if immortality be a part of his organization, he can transmit this. This is self-multiplication—"divisibility"—matter!

Again, *life* itself is transmitted, together with diseases of various kinds. And here we come to a very important consideration, viz: *That which has no constitutional function cannot be diseased.* If matter therefore, in none of its forms and modifications, has any attributes or functions, it can never be diseased. And as the body of man is matter, it cannot be diseased! We never hear of marble or stone being diseased. The diamond is not subject to fever; but vegetables and animals, including man, are liable to disease and death

We come back to the conclusion then, that organized matter is capable of manifesting a variety of functions, which are susceptible of derangement or disease.

But, upon Mr. Lee's hypothesis, disease cannot exist; for matter, having only the properties he ascribes to it, is not susceptible of disease, and immortality *cannot* be diseased; and, therefore, we come to the happy conclusion, that there is no such thing as disease! This is certainly the long-looked for philosophers' stone!

But the truth is, all parts of man are subject to derangement, disease, and death; and still all is matter; but if the mind be "immaterial" or immortal, it can not be deranged or diseased. And here we leave this argument for the present.

In Mr. Lee's article No. 4, he introduces a long quotation from Mr. Watson, in which it is argued, that because "God is spirit" the mind of man is of the same nature. This argument is not only a lame one, but altogether out of place in this connection; so we shall merely observe respecting it,

1st. That the nature of God is not the subject of discussion.

2d. That God *only* hath immortality. And,

3d. That men are exhorted to seek for it, which would be absurd if they had it.

SCRIPTURAL PSYCHOLOGY—NO. II.

In Genesis xlii., 21, we read: "And they said one to another, we are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his *soul*, when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us." This is an allusion to Joseph's being sold by his brethren. They acknowledge their guilt. They tell us of "the *anguish* of his *soul*," when they were about to sell him to the Ishmaelites, and he "besought them not to do it. Did Joseph have an *immortal soul*, which was filled with "*anguish*" at the prospect of being sold? Immortal souls are not the subjects of "anguish;" they are incapable of sorrow or pain. We learn then that Joseph himself was filled with "anguish," and not his immortal soul.

In the 17th chapter, 14th verse, we have the following: "And the uncircumcised male-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that *soul* shall be cut off from his people." Here the term "*soul*" is evidently used as equivalent to "*male-child*," which, if uncircumcised was to be cut off from Israel.

In Genesis xii. 5th, we read of "the *souls*" Abram and Lot had "gotten in Haran." Again, "the king of Sodom said to Abram, give me the *souls*, and take the goods to thyself." Chap. xiv. 21.

"Esau took all the *souls* of his house," and "went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob;" and these "souls" are defined as "his wives, his sons and his daughters." Chap. xxxvi. 6. The "souls" of Jacob by Leah—"all the souls of his sons and his daughters were thirty and three." xlvi. 15. By Zilpha, "sixteen souls;" by Rachel "fourteen souls;" by Bilhah "seven souls." "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, *who came out of his loins*—were sixty and six." Now, if these were immortal souls they came "out of Jacob's loins," and, consequently, immortality is transmissible!

"Two souls were *born* to Joseph in Egypt;" are immortal souls "born" of the flesh? Men are born of *corruptible seed*; is that which is immortal and *in*-corruptible, developed from a *corruptible germ*?

Having examined every passage, or nearly every one, in Genesis where the term *soul* occurs either in the common version or the original, I will now pass to Exodus. Chapter xii. 16, "And in the first day there shall be a holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be a holy convocation to you: no manner of work shall be done in them, *save that which every soul must eat*, that only may be done by you." "Save that which every" *person* or *man* "may eat" is the proper rendering; and Webster so translates it.

Chapter xxiii. 9. "Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger; for ye know the *soul* of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Mr. Webster renders the term "*soul*" in this passage, "*heart*." "Ye know the *heart*"—the feelings of a stranger.

Ch. xxx. 12. "When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every *man a ransom for his soul to the Lord*." A ransom for his *life*; and the reason is given—"*that there may be no plague among them.*"

In chapter xxxi. 14, The Lord in speaking of the sabbath, says "Whoever doeth any work therein, that *soul* shall be cut off from among his people." Here it signifies *person*. It has the same meaning in chap. xii. 15, also, in verse 4th, and in chap. xvi. 16. In chap. xxx. 15, where it speaks of making "*atonement for souls*," it signifies *life*. See also, 16th verse. The word *soul* occurs but seldom in Exodus; the above, I believe, are the principal places. Let us turn to Leviticus.

In the following places it is used for *person* or *persons:* iv. 2, 27; v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17; vi. 2; xvii. 11, 12; xxii. 11; xxiii. 30; xxvi. 15, 43. In the 11th verse of this chapter, where the phrase—"and my *soul* shall not abhor you," it is used in reference to God, and is equivalent to "and I shall not abhor you." In the 17th chapter of Leviticus, 10th verse, we have the following: "And whatever man there may be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set my face against that *soul* that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people." It certainly requires no extraordinary perception to see the meaning of "soul" in the above sentence. What follows throws additional light on the psychology of man. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your *souls*," (your lives;) "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," or life.

Here we have the important truth, that "the *life* of the flesh is *in* the blood." The blood, so to speak, is the menstruum or vehicle of life. The blood, as we have elsewhere stated, is electric and magnetic, as an analysis of its constituent parts will show; but we shall not give an analysis of it at this time. When this position is denied, however, it shall be forthcoming.

Moses was a divine physiologist; he understood the *Homonean philosophy*, or philosophy of man, far better than Pythagorus, Socrates, Plato, or any of the moderns, who ascribe life, intelligence, and every other mental attribute to an "immortal soul."

J. T. W.

ON ATONEMENT.

Far be it from us, that we should be charmed away from the Cross of Christ by any human eloquence or philosophy. What is the doctrine of that Cross whence emanates the life-cry to a lost world? It is, that God has made the soul of his Son "*an offering for (our) sins*," Isa. 53: 10; that he has "laid on him *the iniquity of us all*," 6 v.; that "he *bare the sin of many*," 12 v.; that "he was wounded for *our* transgressions," and "bruised *for our iniquities*," 5 v. He was "cut off, *but not for himself*." Dan. 9: 26. If this language does not reveal the "*vicarious*" sufferings and death of the Son of God, which some persons affirm is a "pernicious doctrine," what confidence, I ask, can we have in any of the words of the scriptures? The Saviour himself and his apostles confirm the obvious import of the words of the prophets. "I lay down my life *for the sheep*." John 10: 15. "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." Mark 10: 45. "Christ died *for our sins*;" Cor. 15: 3; "is sacrificed *for us*," 1 Cor. 5: 7, "that by means of death, *for the redemption of transgressions*," &c. "*to put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9: 15, 26. "*Bare our sins* in his own body on the tree." 1 Peter 2: 24. Without this great and glorious truth of the "vicarious" suffering of the divine Son of the Infinite, "the grand problem" of life for a lost world, finds no solution in the combined wisdom of angels or men.

It was the defence of this very doctrine, that "our Lord Jesus Christ gave himself *for our sins*," that called forth the anathema of the inspired apostle, "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel—let him be accursed." Gal. 1: 3—8. This is the only platform on which our Father's wondrous love places its lever to raise a fallen world.

Justice is "offended," and must be satisfied, or sinners cannot be saved. God is *the just God* as well as the Saviour. How he can be just and save transgressors of his righteous law, is itself a grand problem, solved only by the Cross of Christ. From perverted views of 'offended Justice,' we may turn aside, but we may not turn aside from the oracles of God. "Awake, O Sword, against the man that

is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts, smite the Shepherd," &c. "He shall magnify the law and make it honorable." "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past—*that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth on Jesus.*"

The doctrine of vicarious suffering and death was shadowed forth by all the sacrifices under the law, particularly by the scape goat. These were types of "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." The doctrine may be rejected by the wisdom of this world, yet it pleases God by the foolishness of its preaching, to save them that believe.

HENRY GREW.

FUTURE STATES.

By REV. REGINALD COURTENAY, A. M.

(Continued from page 79.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

It yet remains for us to consider some passages of the New Testament which have been much relied on in proof of an intermediate state of consciousness. Our Saviour thus exhorts his disciples; "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him, who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell;" that is, "in Gehenna." "What," asks an eminent divine, "can be more clear? If the soul had such a necessary dependence on the body, that when this dies itself must needs die with it, then he that kills the body would with the same stroke murder the soul too. But our Saviour tells us that this is impossible for man to do, the soul remaining even after the death of the body, and being out of the reach of any created power, that is able to destroy it. If it be said that this is meant only of the utter destruction of the soul, which no man is able to effect, God having promised a resurrection to life again, this will appear to be only a wretched shift to avoid the force of the plainest text. For in this sense our Saviour might as well have denied that it is in the power of man to kill the *body* of another man, that is, to destroy it utterly and finally, because God will raise it again at the last day. But our blessed Lord grants, that the body may be killed by man in the same sense whereby he denies that the soul can be destroyed by him, and therefore speaks not this only with reference to the resurrection."

It may nevertheless be fairly maintained, consistently with the view of the future states which has been advocated above, that our Lord is here speaking with reference to the resurrection only; and wholly passes over without notice the interval between death and judgment. Shortly after, in the same discourse, he prepares his disciples to bear persecution, by a similar mode of encouragement. "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." And in another place, to exactly the same purpose, "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep in unto life eternal." These passages sufficiently explain what is meant by "not able to kill the soul." Dr. Bull believed that the soul of the renegade, as well as the soul of the martyr, *lives* after the death of the body. But if so, what is meant by "he that loveth his life *shall lose it?*" Even on Dr. Bull's supposition, it *must* signify, not the loss of life in the intermediate state, wherein good and bad men alike live, but the destruction of the soul in Gehenna. Because man cannot effect this, it is said that he is unable to "kill the soul." Agreeably with that doctrine, implied in almost every page of the New Testament,—"It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment,"—they are said to lose, or to keep their lives, in reference to the destruction which will be inflicted, or the immortality which will be conferred on the soul, on that awful day.

St. Luke reports the words of our Lord somewhat differently. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear Him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into Gehenna; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him." Here there is no allusion to an interval between death and judgment; and not only they who have killed the body have no more that they can do, but God himself, it appears, doth nothing, until the day arrive for the execution of his judgments. Throughout all these passages the things contrasted are, life temporal, and life eternal; death temporal, and death eternal,—and we are not to fear them which kill the body, or inflict temporal death; but Him only who can kill the soul, or inflict eternal death.

Dr. Bull however maintains, as we have seen above, that since the bodies of the wicked *rise again*, men can no more be said to be able to kill the body than to kill the soul; except in reference to the different states of the soul and body before resurrection. If the resurrection of the wicked unto damnation were in Scripture represented as a temporary return to *life*, this argument would be unanswerable. But the bodies even of saints are in Scripture termed mortal bodies, and may be killed: though the Almighty can and will at the last day quicken them by His spirit. The temporal life of a sinner being taken away, nothing remains but for him to be "cast into hell;" while the temporal life of the righteous being lost, he still "hath eternal life," in that he has the promise *not given to the sinner*, "I will raise him up at the Last Day." And so St. Paul labored;—"if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."*

"That the soul is alive after our death," says Jeremy Taylor, "St. Paul affirms: 'Christ died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should *live* together with him.' Now it were strange that we should be alive and live with Christ, and do no act of life." Strange indeed: but Christ died for us, and rose again, that we through *death and resurrection* might have that eternal life. Then, when we rise, he will "come again and receive his disciples to himself; that where he is, there may they be also: *then* shall they, and not before, "ever be with the Lord."

* Whatever obscurity and difficulty there may be in the subject here treated of, it arises from the singular use in Scripture, of the terms life and death. To kill the body, and send the soul into Hades, a suffering which may be inflicted on the righteous as well as the sinner, and to destroy the body and soul in the flames of Gehenna, are both called in Scripture, Death. The temporal existence common to all, no less than the spiritual and eternal existence of saints in heaven, is termed Life.

That there is an intermediate consciousness has sometimes been collected from the account of the translations of Enoch and Elijah, and the appearance of the latter, with Moses, at the transfiguration of our Lord. The former of which facts, it shall nevertheless be said, does most strongly point to a conclusion directly opposite, which the difficulty concerning Moses cannot reverse, but at the utmost merely neutralize or obscure. Enoch, we are told "walked with God; and he was not, for *God took him*," and this St. Paul explains by saying that Enoch "was translated, that he *should not see death*." Here to be taken to God, and to die, are represented as directly opposite things. Enoch was saved from Hades, from the power of corruption, from the state of "the dead who cannot praise the Lord;" and admitted to his presence in heaven. Of Elijah we learn that he likewise "was taken up into heaven," without seeing death, without any dissolution of the body, or banishment of the soul to Hades. In both of these cases, undoubtedly, the translation to heaven was a great and a singular reward for singular piety and devotedness. Yet if, apart from resurrection and ascension into heaven, it be, as some believe, a great privilege to be delivered from the burden of the flesh; a privilege involving nearer communion with God, what advantage had Enoch or Elijah? And how can it be said, that *God took them*, rather than any other departed saints? It may be said, that they were at once admitted to that *superior* blessedness which God will confer on all his saints when their bodies are raised in glory at the Last Day.* But the account of Elijah's appearance at the transfiguration precludes this idea. It is true that our Saviour's appearance at that time was such as to give the three favored disciples some conception of his future glory. For it was the fulfilment of his promise made a week previously, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." And St. Peter says in reference to the wonderful scene, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were *eye witnesses* of his majesty." But still it is plain that his full glory and majesty was not then revealed, even to the chosen disciples. For St. John writes, "we know not what we shall be; but we know that when Christ shall appear, we shall be like him, *for we shall see him as he is*." And this, though St. John had beheld Christ not only at his transfiguration, but also in those greater splendours which he records in the book of Revelation; and though St. Paul, who had ample intercourse with the other apostles, had been favoured with repeated visions of Christ. It is plain then that though the glorious appearance which our Lord put on was, in conjunction with the voice of approval from heaven, a *sufficient* proof and manifestation of the glories of his future kingdom, yet it was not a full display of them. Jesus indeed "was not yet glorified;" he had not as yet "ascended into heaven that he might fill all things;" nor testified that "all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth." It is not to be supposed then that they who appeared with him had as yet received *their* full glory. It would therefore be difficult for those who believe in an intermediate consciousness to say in what respect these persons were in a more favored state than other departed saints. And though any one is at liberty to conjecture that some superior degree of blessedness was conferred on Enoch and Elijah, the declaration concerning the former, "He was not, for *God took him*,"—seems to imply a difference not in degree but in *kind*, between the fate of Enoch and that of the rest of the dead. For if it be contended, that God "took" Enoch and Elijah, without death, but that this does not forbid us to believe that he "takes" others, to a similar reward, after their death; we may reply by asking—On this supposition, how does it appear from Genesis that Enoch did not die? The children of Rachel "were not," when they were taken from their mother by death; and therefore when it is written that Enoch "was not," this would rather show that he departed this life in the ordinary way. We can learn that he was translated only from the words, "God took him."

When however the question arises, Whence, from what blisful region did Elijah come, in what form did he appear? much, and indeed insuperable difficulty arises from the appearance of Moses with him. For Moses was not translated that he should not see death; he died upon Mount Nebo. His appearance with Elijah might indeed lead us to conclude that both came from the same world or state, and that the condition of Enoch and Elijah therefore differed not at all from that of the rest of the blessed dead, who die in the Lord. But this notion is wholly incompatible with the fact, that while the translation of the former was a reward, the death of Moses was a *punishment*. Yet how could it be a privation to Moses to be admitted, rather than to the earthly Canaan, to the heaven of Enoch, and Elijah? And how can we suppose that the disembodied spirit of Moses, dwelling in Hades, enjoyed the same life (if life at all,) as they, whose especial reward was that they should not see death; but who were raised, body and soul, to some heavenly region? Surely it is *probable* that Moses and Elias came from different regions; had been in different states. We are not told whether the two wore similar forms. But the power which called Moses' spirit from the grave could render him visible to the eye, for a special purpose, as was Samuel at Endor.* Such similarity of aspect decides nothing with respect to the condition of their souls. It is in the very highest degree improbable that a disembodied soul in Hades should be in the same state as the soul which was raised to heaven, and had never dwelt, as far as we have reason to believe, in any other than a corporeal habitation.

If however any one is inclined to conclude, *from his appearance at the transfiguration*, that Moses was honored after death with translation

* Not that this is exactly in accordance with Scripture, which represents their privilege as consisting specially in *exemption from death*.

* The soul separate from the body is not an object of sight (since at a man's death all that was formerly visible of him remains before our eyes in the corpse,) so that nothing can be inferred respecting a separate state of the soul, from the visible appearance of Moses and Elias, which the apostles witnessed."—*Lectures on a Future State*. That is, nothing can be inferred from the fact of their visibility; though we may nevertheless draw conjectures from the fact of their then consciousness.

into the heaven of Enoch and Elijah, this will by no means render it probable that other departed saints enjoy a similar blessedness to that of these distinguished servants of God.

This conclusion is strengthened by the accounts which the Scriptures have given us concerning the miraculous raising of the dead. For nothing can be collected from these accounts to show, or even faintly suggest, that the souls of the persons raised were summoned from a world of consciousness. They appear to have awakened as from a profound and dreamless sleep. If they had been recalled from the heaven of Enoch and Elijah, would they have foreborne to speak of it; to reveal somewhat concerning this glorious state or place of the dead? Yet tradition, full of fond and vain fictions as it is, does not even profess to record a revelation of this kind; nor even offer us as genuine one single testimony, by any of these persons, in proof of an intermediate consciousness.

Further; it would be hard to imagine in what way resurrection could be a blessing, or indeed how it could be other than a severe trial and affliction, except on the supposition that the dead are, literally, "in a land where all things are forgotten." Let us turn to the case of Lazarus. He "slept;" and our Saviour proceeded to Bethany, to "awake him out of sleep." Did this mean, to summon his soul from the lower heavens; nay, as some would suppose, from the society of angels, and just men made perfect, and bring it back to reoccupy its frail tenement of clay in this world of sorrow and sin? Surely this would be consistent neither with the words, nor the gracious design of our Saviour.

If it be objected that St. Paul has said, "to die is gain;" this can be equally well explained either on the supposition of an intermediate consciousness, or of a momentary hiding in the grave until the indignatiou be overpast: while on the other hand, the apparent discordance between the words of St. Paul, and the fact of our Lord's raising the dead, is certainly the less, when we adopt the supposition that they were raised from a state of mental torpor.

IS THIS AGE FINAL, OR PREPARATORY?

No. II.

ISAIAH ELEVENTH CONSIDERED.

On this chapter immense labor has been bestowed to harmonize it with the theory of the burning up of the world in 1843; but still it reads just as it always did, and shows conclusively an age in this world that has never yet been seen, and never can be, if there is not a dispensation yet future differing essentially from any that has ever gone before. Here is presented to us a Branch out of the root of Jesse. None will doubt but that the Son of David—the Son of God—is here intended. Under his government the animal creation will become changed so as to be harmless and docile; and "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for, THE EARTH SHALL BE FULL OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LORD, AS THE WATERS COVER THE SEA. And in *that day* [when the earth is thus full of the knowledge of the Lord] there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious." That is not all: "It shall come to pass IN THAT DAY that the Lord shall set his hand *again* THE SECOND TIME to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left from Assyria," &c. Not the gathering of spiritual Jews, but his people whom he had once before gathered: not a gathering from Babylon, as will soon be seen: that gathering was not in "*that day*" just spoken of. "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth." Here the language distinctly marks the two nations into which the posterity of Jacob were divided in the days of Rhehoboam, son of Solomon: one nation was called Judah, and the other Israel, and sometimes Ephraim, from the principal tribe of the nation of Israel. This latter nation was not "scattered," but was "cast out" of the land of Israel into Assyria, some hundred years before Judah was carried captive into Babylon. Israel was therefore called "outeasts," as in the text before us: see also 2 Kings 17: 20. Nor was "Judah dispersed" to the "four corners of the earth" till their Temple was destroyed by the Romans. The promise in this text, therefore, clearly relates to their gathering subsequent to that destruction; and as no such gathering ever has taken place, it must still be future, and is not "conditional," and is as certain as a "*Thus saith the Lord*" can make it. If any doubt remained, the next verse would dispel it: "The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim."

Before Ephraim or Israel was carried away into Assyria, there was continual strife, contention, and war between the two nations. When one shall be assembled and the other gathered, this envy and vexing each other shall be known no more. And let it never be forgotten, these things are to be done "*in that day*" when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord;" of course future, and a glorious day. In that day, verse 16, "There shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he *came up out of the land of Egypt.*" Here we see what the first "recovering" was, which is alluded to, verse 11, where it is said, "The Lord shall set his hand again the *second time* to recover the remnant of his people," &c. It was their being brought up out of Egypt, and it is "the remnant" of the same people of whom the prophet speaks.

The prophet then goes on to tell us what that people will say when gathered: "And IN THAT DAY thou shalt say, O LORD, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me. Behold, God *is* my salvation! I will trust, and not be afraid: for the LORD JEHOVAH *is* my strength and *my* song; he also is become my salvation. Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation. And in that day shall ye say, Praise the LORD, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted. Sing unto the LORD; for he hath done excellent things: THIS IS KNOWN IN ALL THE EARTH. Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of

Zion: for great *is* the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee."—Isaiah 12. This subject is made so plain by the prophet that it does really seem wonderful that any should call in question the meaning of the prophecy, or attempt to spiritualize it. That it applies to any events that have ever yet occurred, can not be shown. That it is not a conditional promise is equally manifest. So surely as the BRANCH of Jesse's root ever reigns on earth, so surely, "in that day," will these things come to pass: so we believe.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—All the numbers for 1848 can still be supplied. No subscription will be received for a less time than one volume. Any person who will send us *two* new subscribers with one dollar current money, free of expense, shall have, as *a premium*, one copy of Dobney, in paper cover, or, three copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo. pamphlet of 120 pages: or, three copies of the "Christian Psalmody" in paper covers. Please state distinctly which you will have, and how they shall be sent.

"CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, OR PSALMS AND HYMNS FOR THE USE OF ALL CHRISTIANS" is the title of the new Hymn Book we are publishing, and which will be ready for delivery before our distant subscribers receive this paper. The authors of this compilation have labored to present it free from those objections which are justly urged against other selections: and they flatter themselves that no intelligent christian will find cause for objection to the work. The work is designedly small, and yet, sufficiently large to give variety. The largeness of a Hymn Book is no recommendation, as most congregations confine themselves to a *select few* out of the mass. In that now presented the compilers have labored to embody this select few.

The work is got up neatly, 24mo., 128 pages, in paper covers, at 15 cents single copy; $1 per dozen, or, $8 per hundred. *Cash always with the order.*

BR. WM. G. MORSE, of Springfield Mass., we are afflicted to learn, died of the Small Pox, in its most malignant form, Friday, May 18th. Br. R. E. Ladd writes, that "He fell asleep as he had lived a consistent, humble christian, and in full hope of a glorious immortality at the coming of Christ." We would mingle our tears with those of his afflicted wife and children; and we offer for their consolation that Jesus our "Lord" will soon be "*here*," and He is "the resurrection and the life:" so that our beloved brother will sleep but a short time before he will hear that same voice that called Lazarus out of the grave, saying "*William come forth.*" "I will raise *him* up at the last day" is the promise of our soon coming Lord and Life.

THE TRUE WESLEYAN AND IMMORTALITY.—We ask our readers carefully to examine the "Review," by our Assistant Editor, of the articles of Rev. Luther Lee, Editor of the Wesleyan. Here are two master minds; one on each side of the question. We would gladly publish the articles of the True Wesleyan entire if our room would admit; though we really think, by giving Br. Lee's article "No. 2." entire in the last Examiner, we have given the *gist* of his whole argument on the philosophy of man's natural immortality. What he has said since is only an amplification of the same points, which when stripped of all their dress are summed up thus:—

1. *There are only two primary substances, viz.: matter and spirit.* 2. *Matter has no power of self-motion or self-determination, however it may be organized.* 2. *Therefore, wherever we see matter endowed with this power there must have been added to it an immortal spirit or soul.*

This, we say, is the very soul of all the Wesleyan has said on the philosophy of immortality; and, if it is true, it endows every animal, insect, or crawling worm upon earth with an immortal soul, just as *really* as man; and strips Jesus Christ of all the glory of bestowing immortality upon us by his work and mediation.

The "Review," when finished, will be transposed into a book, 18mo.: and we hope friends will be prepared to give it a wide circulation in that form, especially among the readers of the "True Wesleyan." The price of the work will be given when we find what it will cost.

DEFINITE TIME FOR THE ADVENT OF CHRIST.—We see by some of our exchanges, an effort is again made to fix such a time. Whether that discovery will ever be made we shall not argue now; but one thing to our mind is perfectly clear, and that is,—no such discovery will ever be made by the *modus operandi* now in use: *viz.*, That the "70 weeks," of Dan. 9th, terminated within the period of the first advent, or three and a half years after. Nothing is plainer to us than that the 70 weeks include all the time till "*the holy city*" was given up to the Gentiles; or, to that time when Jerusalem was compassed about with armies. Our Lord commanded his disciples to "*begin*," their work "at Jerusalem;" and he never told them to leave it out of their labor till "ye shall see Jerusalem compassed about with armies:" then, and not before, terminated the "70

weeks determined upon thy people AND *thy holy city*, to finish transgression." Then their iniquity was "filled up :" and then the "condemnation to the fire of Gehenna" came upon the city and people; and in the middle of one week, following the 70, the sacrifice and the whole Jewish ritual was made to cease, by the destruction of the temple and its services. Till the advocates of definite time abandon their premises, about the end of the 70 weeks, they labor in vain.

SUPPORT FOR THE EXAMINER,—Just as our paper was going to press, we received the following communication, which we insert by request of the writer, who has long been known by many of our readers.

NEW YORK, May 31st, 1849.

DEAR BRO. STORRS,—I am sorry to see by your last paper, that the Examiner has received so feeble a support: in view of which, allow me to ask your readers if they are aware that Bro. Storrs, from affluence, has become poor since he embraced the great truths of *life* and *death?* Do they really know that he has devoted as much time as has been necessary to the supervision of the paper without receiving money enough to pay the printer? Are they willing that it shall now go down without an effort to succor it? I trust not—but that we all, according to our ability, may do something to sustain and extend its influence.

The Examiner may not, upon all points, advocate the views we hold and deem important, but are we for that to withhold our support? Are not the enemies of the glorious truths we believe withering up on every side? and by mistatements and every device of the adversary doing all they can to disparage the truth, and those who uphold it? Whatever may be the opinion of others, it is my firm belief, that the Examiner advocates a view of the divine law of the utmost importance; and one intimately connected with those of the ressurrection and the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

The paper has contained single articles worth the subscription; and I hope that soon we shall have a *weekly* instead of monthly, to scatter broad cast these truths through the length and breadth of the land. I would suggest, as Bro. Storrs is not wont to put forth appeals for aid in every paper, that all the friends will hear the call that has been made, and send each according to his ability, as the Lord hath prospered him.

Yours, in the hope of Endless Life,

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN.

N. B.—All who are able, should get as many copies of Dobney as possible, and circulate in their respective neighborhoods. They will thus not only help Bro. Storrs, but give circulation to one of the most important theological works ever published. *One hundred thousand* copies ought to be scattered immediately. H. A. C.

PREACHING every Lord's day by the Editors of this paper at Commissioners Hall, Third St. below Green, morning and evening.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST.—We learn that one objection to the Examiner is, that we do not say enough on the above topic. We firmly believe that event is now "nigh, even at the door;" but we have no idea of attempting to find out an exact day or year for its occurrence, unless *events* future should shed more light on prophecy and prophetic numbers than has ever yet been elicited; and we think the propensity to do it tends to an intolerant spirit that ill becomes those who are looking for the advent. The leading advent paper (we mean of Mr. Miller's school) said in March 1844—"There are none of the prophetic periods, as we understand them, extending beyond the Jewish year 1843. The above we shall *ever* maintain as the *immutable* truth of the word of God, and therefore, till our Lord come, we shall ever look for his return as *the next event* in historical prophecy." Yet, the same paper made large professions of its wisdom in discovering that the tremendous events of 1848 were a wonderful *fulfilment of prophecy*, giving evidence that they had always been right in their theory: and they say, in 1849—"We hail the emancipation of the sons of Abraham from their long, cruel, and ignominious political and religious bondage to the Gentile powers of earth, as another evidence of God's faithfulness in fulfilling his word," &c. Now what is all this but saying, *indirectly*, (for they never "*confess*" *directly*) "We thought, in 1844, there was no more historical prophecy to have a fulfilment prior to the advent, but great things have come to pass that we looked not for: nevertheless, we will turn these things to our account, and make the most of them to keep up the appearance of the truth of our theory."

After the "Jewish year" 1844 had passed away, one of the conductors of the paper, of which we have spoken, held the following language in his Harmony of Prophetic Chronology, and Time of the Advent to be Known, in which he leaves the "Jewish year 1843" and stretches out the period to the "end of 1847." "*Those who are brought to view as the subjects of the wrath of God at the Second Advent, are those who reject the testimony of God on the time of that event.*" Yet, "the *time*" of this leader has *all* failed; but his developments since have painfully shown that his uncharitableness, and that of his associates, has *not* failed. We see that these leaders have been mistaken both in *time* and in *events;* and yet they have severely denounced *us* for "not fol-

lowing" them. After 1844 we looked for and expected to see the breaking in pieces of the monarchies of Europe *before* the advent; and were not taken by surprise when the French revolution of 1848, and the events following, occurred. We believed, before their occurrence, that such "historical prophecy," or prophetic events, would occur *before* the "return" of our Lord.

We believe that many "historical prophecies" are still to have a fulfilment on *this* earth, *before* the "new heaven and new earth" of Rev. 21; but how many of them are to be prior to the second advent, or personal return of our Lord, we do not know. Were we believers of the school above referred to —that is, believers in the theory that denies the return of the literal posterity of Jacob "to the land wherein their fathers have dwelt"—that maintains the burning of the whole globe at the precise time of the advent, immediately to be succeeded by the new heaven and new earth, and the ending of probation to all the human family, without regard to the unavoidable ignorance of many—we say, were we believers in such positions, we could not, with our present light, believe that the advent would occur for many years to come, unless we were to account many of the prophecies as "cunningly devised fables."

While we by no means approve or condemn all that is published in those papers claiming the peculiar name of "*Advent*" Papers, we have thought they furnish as much reading on that topic as would answer the largest desires of the class of our readers who feel that subject to be the one on which they delight most to dwell; and we have supposed that these readers of the Examiner take one or other of those papers, which are published weekly. We have always avowed, that the *principal* object of the Bible Examiner is the full discussion of the Immortality question. And while one of the advent papers, viz., "The Harbinger and Advocate," published at Rochester, N. Y., by Elder Joseph Marsh, gives a considerable amount of matter on the immortality question, there is no paper that enters so largely into the subject, or that has the means of doing it, as the Examiner, and this at a price that places it within the reach of all.

We intend to have more variety as soon as we can find room for it. Yet, we believe our paper is not without variety; and supplies a place that no other in the nation does or can. The development of the spread of the great truths we advocate, of no immortality to man out of Christ, nor without a resurrection from the dead, in England, within the last few years, has disposed us to occupy a large portion of our paper with extracts from that source, to the exclusion of much that would otherwise have appeared in our columns on other topics. We consider, however, whatever others may think, that this question of immortality lies at the foundation of every other truth of the Bible relating to salvation; and that no one can fully understand what man needs, and what the gospel proposes to do for him, that does not understand this subject; nor can he see either the importance or value of the second personal advent of Christ, unless he understands this truth, viz., "If no resurrection, there is no future life," and "if no second personal advent of Christ, then there is no resurrection:" and, consequently, our immortality and future life depends upon that advent and the resurrection by Christ, who is the "resurrection and the life." But our immortality or future life, neither of them, depend upon Christ or his advent, if men are possessed of immortality by creation, or natural generation: and, as a consequence, there would be no use in the resurrection; and the coming of Christ again would be a matter of very little importance. Hence we feel safe in saying, as a general thing, those who believe the common theory of man's natural immortality do not and cannot feel the value of those grand gospel truths—the personal advent of Christ, and the resurrection of the dead.

MORAL DEPRAVITY—ORIGINAL SIN.

No. II.

We now proceed with our examination of those texts which are supposed to sustain the position of the "Assembly's Catechism," as presented in our previous number. It is an easy matter to throw together a number of texts that seem to prove the common theory; and if time-worn traditions are to settle the meaning of those texts, without the aid of other portions of scripture, or the use of the faculties God has given us to search the scriptures, as those who must give account for themselves, we might conclude the Assembly of Divines and their adherents are right in their declaration, that we all inherit a morally depraved nature from Adam, "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually."

We shall now take up Psa. 51: 5: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." This text is considered conclusive by the advocates of inherent moral depravity. Truly, if it is, the Psalmist, instead of confessing his sin, hides himself under a cloak, as most other sinners do who believe the common theory. He had committed great sins—murder and adultery. If he does affirm the doctrine usually drawn from the text, he throws the blame first on his mother, and then indirectly, at least, on God. Let us see. "Why did I sin these great sins?" Ans. "Because my mother conceived me in sin;" i. e. "conveyed to me moral depravity." And again, we ask him, Why did you commit these enormous sins? Ans. "I was shapen in iniquity:" But who shapened you? Ans. "Thy [God's] hands have made me and fashioned me:"—Psa. 119: 73. We sum up thus—"I have committed adultery and murder, *because* God made and fashioned me in iniquity in my mother's womb." The blasphemy of such a

position is apparent, and it is the legitimate result of the doctrine of inherent moral depravity. Let the advocates of that doctrine not blush to own their own child, if determined to maintain a theory like that of the Assembly's Catechism. If it be asked, what did the Psalmist mean if that was not his meaning? We answer in the language of Wesley on another topic, "It were better to say there is no meaning at all, than to attribute such a sense to the language." To charge the God of truth and holiness—who hateth iniquity—with having caused the birth of untold millions with a moral nature "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all spiritual good, and wholly inclined to all evil," &c. is a blasphemy, one would think, enough to make a devil tremble to utter.

We reply, however, that the language is of similar import to that in Psa. 58: 3: "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." Now we all know that none "*speak*" at all "*as soon as they be born*:" and hence, the most that can be made of the expression is, that those who are now wicked, commenced an early course of wickedness. That a want of attention to truth in early life has resulted, as all know it does and will result, in confirmed wickedness and falsehood. So the most that can be made of the Psalmist's sentiment, Psa. 51: 5, is, that in his humiliation and penitence for his sin, he speaks in a style of *hyperbole*, which is not uncommon under deep feeling, when the mind struggles to give utterance to its emotions; but the *exaggeration* in such cases is not misunderstood by any who have not a theory to serve.

But again,—if the Psalmist's expression proved, so far as *he* was concerned, that he was born with a nature morally depraved, which we do not admit, it could not prove that all other men were in like manner. Job affirms the opposite of himself; for, he declares he had cared for "the fatherless and widow," and that he had "guided her from" his "mother's womb:" Job 31: 15–18. Here, then, is proof of one of Adam's posterity that was not born with a nature "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all spiritual good," &c.; for, James declares, that "pure religion, and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows," &c. Job affirms that he did this from his "mother's womb." Just as early as David was corrupt, Job was pure; so that if we give the advocates of inherent moral pollution the full benefit of Psa. 51: 5, their *theory* is at an infinite distance from being established; and, especially, when the holy and blessed God has warned us all against using the "proverb that the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."

The next text urged in support of the common theory, that we will notice, is Job 15: 14: "What *is* man, that he should be clean? and *he which is* born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" If this text proves anything for that theory, it proves too much. It would prove that Jesus Christ himself had a morally depraved nature—he was "born of a woman." Not to press that point, however, we ask, Who utters these words? Do you say, They are inspiration. We reply, Just as much as the words, "thou shalt not surely die," are inspiration. "Eliphaz the Temanite" is the speaker; of him the Lord says, chap. 42: 7: "My wrath is kindled against *thee*, and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of me right," &c. Here is the Lord's own testimony that Eliphaz's discourses are not inspiration, and therefore are not authority: and mark—when Eliphaz had finished the discourse of which we are speaking, Job commenced, chap. 16: 3, by calling that discourse "*vain words.*" In that same discourse, verse 4, Eliphaz charged Job with casting off fear, and restraining prayer before God; which, to say the least, was not true; and hence we may expect to find other untruths in his talk, and none more so than the insinuation in the verse under consideration.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

Ephesians Chap. III.

Verse 13. Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

Because of the access and glorious privileges spoken of, "I desire that ye faint not"—that you do not despond, or be timid—"at my tribulations" distresses, calamities, the pressure that is on me—"for you"—or, on your account,—"which is your glory:" that is, they were to conduce to their inheriting the glory of which he had spoken in the previous part of the epistle.

Verses 14—19. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.

"For this cause"—that you may inherit glory, "I bow my knees"—in prayer—"unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"—through whom alone we can have access to the Father: and—"of"—from—"whom the whole family"—*patria*, kindred, tribe, race, progeny—"in heaven"—who have been translated, as Enoch and Elijah; or, who may have been of the number who "came out of their graves after his resurrection"—"and in earth are named." The whole race of saints, wherever they are, and whenever they lived, derive their spiritual and divine life *from* him, as the appointed head of this family; and therefore take his *name* whose nature they possess; as children take the name of their father. As the head of this family all communications with his Father are made through and in the name of Christ. Thus, to the Father, Paul said he prayed, "That he would grant you"—of this family, who are still on earth—"according to the riches of his glory"—according to his glorious riches, wealth, or abundance, which is inexhaustible and unsearchable—"to be strengthened with might"—increased in power—"by his Spirit"—which is the efficient agency in communicating power, or might—"in the inner man"—or, that new and spiritual nature derived from Christ, and through union with him, "that Christ may dwell in your hearts"—that Christ may have a home, a permanent place, in your minds, or affections, so that every thought shall be under the government of that Spirit with which he was filled. This home, or residence, for

Christ in the hearts, or affections, cannot be attained except "by faith," a strong and unwavering confidence in God, through his Son, who is the medium, and the only one, through which the Spirit of God is communicated to men. The apostle prayed that such communication of the Spirit might be made, "that being rooted and grounded in love," taking root, or striking roots into, and made firm in love. The figure is beautiful. Love is the *soil* in which, and in which *alone*, the christian can grow: God is love: Christ is the gift of love; the grand office of the Spirit is to shed abroad the love of God in the heart of believers: they are planted in love: they should strike their roots deep therein, and become firm and unmovable in it: thus will they honor the God of love, resemble Christ in love, become unblamable in love; and so attain unto the full and perfect adoption of children to God, and partake of his immortality, incorruptibility, and endless life, at the revelation of Jesus Christ. And Paul desired that they might now be rooted and grounded in love, so that they "may be able"—fully able—"to comprehend," to understand, to know, to lay hold of—"with all saints"—in company with all the holy ones—"what is the breadth"—how wide—"and length," how extensive—"and depth"—how inscrutable, or unsearchable—"and height"—how high the elevation of the love of God—"and to know the love of Christ:" here the apostle, himself, has attained that elevation in description that his own head, as it were, becomes giddy, and he exclaims from astonishment at his discoveries—"WHICH PASSETH KNOWLEDGE." Well said, truly: it is even so: and the loftiest intellect that shines and expands before the throne of God must now, and will forever, have to make the same acknowledgment. Well, saith the apostle, I will stop here in my effort to describe THE LOVE of Christ and God; but I pray, "that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Truly, this wish is the cap stone of the arch, and all language fails in any attempt at exposition: we will only add—*Even so, Amen.*

Verses 20 and 21. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us. Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

The apostle after his masterly flight, in his attempt at a description of the love of God and Christ, seems unwilling to descend till he had planted a standard even above the cap stone, and he proceeds to give a shout of triumph while he runs up the flag of the kingdom, and says, "Now unto him who is able to do"—how much, Paul?—"all we ask"—yes, and all we think, yea, and—"above"—over, beyond—"all we ask or think:" and not only beyond that, but "abundantly above" it: yea, "*exceeding* abundantly above all we ask or think." We can *ask* for much, but, we may *think* of more, perhaps, than we dare ask for; but after all, in our deepest and highest thoughts, we do not, hardly, begin to reach even the outskirts of the treasures God has in store for, and which he is able to give to, those that love and obey him through his Son. But, says the apostle, he is able to do these things "according to the power that worketh in us," by which we were formed of the dust, brought up in animal nature, developed an intellectual nature, now a spiritual nature, whereby we are already made partakers of the divine nature: and what cannot that power effect which has already accomplished so much? Who shall fix its bounds? Who can tell where or when it is to stop in its developments in us? Will it stop with this age? No: therefore, "Now unto him be glory in the church"—the assembly of the holy ones—"by Christ Jesus"—who is the head of that assembly; through him let glory be given to God, his Father and our Father—"throughout all ages, world"—*aionon*, ages—"without end"—or, throughout all the *endless succession of ages*. This age is not to terminate the wonders of God's love and power. There is to be a continued, an endless number of ages, succeeding each other; each rising higher in glory and in the richness of their developments, without ever exhausting the fulness of God. The idea of the next age being the last is a dream of ignorance, a mere fancy, unsupported by the Scriptures, and at war with the Divine administration, so far as it has yet been developed. What unthought of glories, then, still lie in the future. We have no need of "endless torments" to stimulate us to seek eternal life: "the joy set before us" is ample. The preaching endless torture, as a motive to seek and serve God, has only originated in ignorance and superstition. Let the Scripture truth of God's love and kind designs take its place, and see if we do not have a more consistent race of Christians.

DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

WE give the following extract from a pamphlet on the above topic, by Eld. Jabez Chadwick, of Enfield Centre, N. Y. The author is an educated man, of the Christian denomination. It expresses our views on the subject, and we cheerfully endorse it.

The atonement is a cardinal doctrine of the Christian religion. And all Christians so regard it. Nevertheless, it is viewed in very different lights. And the views of those, claiming the title of *orthodox*, have undergone various changes and modifications. Opinions concerning it, which were once deemed of vital importance, are now rejected by a great majority of the churches, as unscriptural, and inconsistent with the grace of pardon, and the justice of damnation. The doctrine, however, is not rescued by these changes and modifications from all perversion and mistake. It is a subject which manifestly requires further investigation.

It will be my object in this essay to remove the misapprehension, and correct the abuse which has attended, and still attends this doctrine, and to place it before the reader in its Scriptural light.

In the first place, much will depend on the right *definition* of the term, atonement. Things should be called by their *proper* names, and *clear* and *definite* meanings should be affixed to the words we use in relation to any subject. A deficiency here cannot fail to be attended with much confusion and perplexity.

What, then, is the true *definition* of atonement? I answer, that it is the *reconciliation, agreement,* or *coming together,* which is affected between *men* and *God,* through the mediation of Jesus Christ.

That this definition is correct will appear from critical examination of the original Greek word

which is translated "the atonement." This is "*tee katallagee*," the true meaning of which is *the reconciliation*. The word atonement occurs but once in the English version of the New Testament, viz., Rom. v: 11, whereas the original word occurs several times: but, except in the aforesaid passage, it is rendered *reconciliation*. It also occurs a number of times in its verbal, or participial form, and is rendered *reconcile*, *reconciling*, and *reconciled*. It also occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and is rendered sometimes *atonement*, and sometimes *reconciliation*, *reconciled*, &c.

The above mentioned passage in Romans reads thus: "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." (Gr. *teen katallageen*, *accusative case*, i. e. *the reconciliation*.) Atonement was formerly used by the English to mean *reconciliation* and pronounced *at-one-ment*. Unless the translators considered this as its true signification, it is hard to account for their rendering the same Greek word, letter for letter, once *atonement*, and twice, at least, *reconciliation*. I wish it to be duly remembered that the words, "the atonement," in Rom. v: 11, and "reconciliation," which occurs twice in 2 Cor. v: 18, 19, are from the same Greek term, and in the latter cases, as well as in the former, the Greek article is prefixed, so that it should have read "*the* reconciliation," instead of "reconciliation." There is manifestly no reason why the article should not be expressed here, as it is in the passage in Romans. "The ministry of reconciliation" or "the words of reconciliation" committed to Paul and others, does not pertain to *any* method of reconciliation, but to a certain, peculiar, *definite* method, described in the Gospel, and hence it should have been emphasized by prefixing the definite article, as it is in Greek. It is further evident that *reconciliation* is the true meaning of *atonement*, from the fact that the Greek word, from which it is rendered, occurs frequently in its verbal, or participial form in the New Testament, and is rendered invariably *reconcile*, *reconciled*, or *reconciling*. It occurs twice in the context of Rom. v: 11, and is rendered "were reconciled," and "being reconciled." The verbal, or participial form of this Greek word occurs also several times in the beforementioned v. chapter of 2 Cor., and is rendered "hath reconciled," "reconciling," and "reconciled." It occurs also in the same sense, Rom. xi: 15, Eph. ii: 16, and Col. i: 20, 21.

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that to *atone*, in the New Testament sense of the term, is to *reconcile*; and that the *atonement* is the *reconciliation*, viz., the reconciliation which is effected between *men* and *God* by the mediation and work of Christ.

Reconciliation appears also to be the appropriate meaning of the word, as it is used in the Old Testament. The original Hebrew word is said to have another signification, viz., cleansing: but I believe that all concede that reconciliation is *one* of its meanings. And it appears that this is the sense in which the inspired writers, generally, if not always, use the word, when speaking of sacrifices, and other means of obtaining intercourse and favor with God.

Atonement was indeed made by various means; but reconciliation is the sense which its different applications will bear. Moses, for instance, made an atonement for the sins of Israel *by prayer*. Ex. xxxii: 30. "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord: peradventure, I shall make an atonement for your sin." Aaron, in the time of the plague, made an atonement, by taking a censor, and fire from off the altar and putting incense thereon, and offering it to the Lord, as he stood between the living and the dead. See Num. xvi: 40—48. Phineas made an atonement when he executed summary justice upon Cozby and the Midianitish harlot, by thrusting a javelin through both their bodies. See Num. xxv: 7—13. And from time to time, the priests made an atonement by sprinkling the blood of the victims which had been offered in sacrifice, "upon" and "before the mercy-seat" in the inner court. The atonement did not consist in killing and offering the victims. These were only the *means* of it. The atonement, itself was made *subsequently*, by sprinkling the blood as above, or in such other ways as God directed.

In all these cases, we may attach the sense of *reconciliation* to the word *atonement*. Indeed, Aaron, in making atonement for "the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar," is expressly said to "have made an end of *reconciling* them." See Levit. xvi: 20. It is also written, ch. vi: 20, "And no sin offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to *reconcile* withal in the holy place shall be eaten: it shall be burned with fire." *Reconcile* is manifestly used here as a substitute for the word *atone*. Again in ch. viii: 15, Moses is said to have "sanctified the altar to make *reconciliation* upon it," i. e. *atonement*. Moreover, in the time of Hezekiah, it is said, 2 Chron. xxix: 24, that the priests killed the bullocks selected for sacrifice, and made *reconciliation* with their blood upon the altar to make an *atonement* for all Israel: for the king commanded that the burnt offering and the sin offering should be made for all Israel." Here the sense of reconciliation is given to the word *atonement*. It is, therefore, clear that this is the radical meaning. The atonement was not the *sacrifice itself;* but the *end* which was thereby effected after the blood was sprinkled as directed. The sacrifice was the *means* and the *atonement*, or *reconciliation*, was the *end* obtained.

So the sacrifice of Christ, to which the typical atonements referred, was not the *atonement itself;* but only the *means* of it. There is as plain a difference, in this case, as in the other, between the *means* and the *end*.

The sacrifice of Christ is often referred to, as though it constituted the atonement: whereas it was only the means of it. The atonement itself, i. e. the *reconciliation*, was a subsequent thing, and was effected by his appearing before God in the heavenly sanctuary, "not with the blood of bulls and goats: but with his own blood," and continuing to intercede in our behalf. The offering of himself, inclusive of his whole mediatorial work, is to be considered in the light of appointed and necessary *means*, with reference to an important *end*, viz., *the reconciliation* between *men* and *God*. To substitute the *end*, which is *the reconciliation*, for the *means*, whereby it is effected, viz., the work of Christ, is to confound things which are obviously different. This want of a proper discrimination between the *means* and the *end* has led to great misunderstandings, perplexity, and abuse, which I

shall show hereafter. For the present, I shall only define the reconciliation in question.

"IMPORTANCE OF THE RESURRECTION."

We give the following extract from Dobney's new work, hoping it may interest our readers so that they will desire to see the book, and send for it. We wish that work scattered far and wide, and as soon as possible. Public mind, religiously, is shaken; and unless some more consistent theory than "endless torment,"—which grows out of the notion of man's *natural immortality*—can be shown to be the doctrine of the Bible, we may soon see infidelity sweep the churches themselves with the besom of destruction. If ministers would not be swept away with a swelling flood, that is rising, let them learn, and fearlessly proclaim—*No immortality out of Christ*—and, "*All the wicked will God destroy.*" Some say—"It is non-essential." They may learn otherwise when too late.

It has been already submitted that scripture recognises only two bodies for man—the present animal-body, *soma psuchikon*, and the spiritual body, *soma pneumatikon*, and at the same time knows nothing of any conscious existence in a perfectly disembodied state. Which of course makes the resurrection [leaving it as yet an open question, what is meant by it precisely, and when it takes place] to be all-important. It at the same time undoubtedly teaches the immediate enjoyment by the saint of the presence of his Saviour, and the blessedness of heaven. In confirmation of which remarks, the reader is requested to study attentively in its connection—

2 Corinthians, *chap.* iv.

17. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

18. While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.

Chapter v.

1. For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

2. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.

3. If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked.

4. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.

5. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit.

6. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord.

7. (For we walk by faith, not by sight:)

8. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord.

At the close of chap. iv. the apostle testifies how lightly his manifold afflictions sat upon him. And afflictions were they of no ordinary kind,—'troubled on every side — perplexed — persecuted—always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus—always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake;' or, as he speaks in a subsequent chapter, when he is compelled to compare himself with others,—'in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes, save one: thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren: in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.' Yet with sublimest heroism he points to calamities and sufferings which would drink up the spirits of most of us, and says 'These light afflictions! these light afflictions!' Do we ask the secret of this victorious composure? He tells us that he was habitually regarding the unseen realities of the next state, 'Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, *shall raise up us also by Jesus*, and shall present us with you.'

Here we perceive distinctly that it was his confidence in a resurrection that lightened his spirit of its load, and cheered him on his lonely and stormy way. We ought to compel ourselves to notice this, agreeing exactly as it does with his wont on other occasions. For it was his habit to console himself with the thought of being raised from the dead, which was the 'recompense of the reward' unto which 'he had respect;' as the first chapter of this epistle also shows, for having said 'We would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure above strength, insomuch, that we despaired even of life,' he goes on to say, 'But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God *who raiseth the dead.*' 2 Cor. i. 8–9.

But let us return to our proper passage. The apostle having said that notwithstanding all his troubles he persevered in his arduous course, animated with the confident hope that God who raised up Jesus *would also raise him up*, v. 14, regarded without displacency the perishing of his outward man, v. 16, seeing that his afflictions would work out for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, v. 17. For he was accustomed not to look at the visible, which is the fugitive, but at the unseen and eternal. v. 18.

Let it be observed that all this grows directly and continuously out of v. 14, (v. 15 being parenthetical, and arising out of the last clause of the preceding verse.) The being *raised up by Jesus* is the thought which, as the grand source of his joy, and secret of his career, he is dwelling on, which reconciles him to the perishing of the outward man, and makes his afflictions light as the gossamer. Our division of chapters here is peculiarly unfortunate; v. 1—8 being but a continuation of the interesting subject, the word, For, marking the close logical connection,—'For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved,' called before our outward man perishing, 'we have a building of God, a house not made with hands,' that is, another body,—'eternal in the

heavens.' Which does not mean that the body he would have was at that time in heaven waiting for him to enter into it, but it was a heavenly body, a body invested wherewith, he should dwell for ever in the heavens. But it may be allowed me to paraphrase the entire passage, without pausing to give the reasons for the rendering I shall adopt, which I trust will be obvious to the general reader. Continuing the thought which he had announced towards the close of chapter iv. he thus proceeds,—

"For we know full well, that if our body, which alone persecutors can hurt, or hunger and fatigue affect, were to be overcome of death, which sooner or later must be, we are quite assured that we shall be found more gloriously arrayed. This indeed is a vile body in which we often groan, feeling acutely the ills of life, but Christ is able to endow us with a body fashioned like unto his own glorious body. And such awaits us. I have called the present body a house, and as such what is it but an earthly house—a house of dust—in the formation of which human beings were (instrumentally) employed; but the body I shall have, or to keep to the figure, the house which awaits me, is in no-wise of human origin [not made with hands] it is celestial [in the heavens] and unlike this changing, decaying structure, is eternal.

"Oh! how I long to find myself in this celestial body, [earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with my house which is from heaven.] I say, I could long for evening to undress, to lay down this gross corporeal investiture, and find myself in that body of heavenly texture which awaits me. For I have no fear of being found utterly disembodied; and though, if such a thing might be, I could prefer to pass without dying into my ultimate condition as Enoch and Elijah did, yet am I more than ready to welcome the sharpest pangs of death, in order to find myself relieved of all the ills attendant on humanity in its present condition, and invested with that spiritual body in which I shall, oh glorious hour! find myself present with the Lord. For in this body I am absent from my Saviour, in that I shall be for ever with the Lord."

To me it appears that this purposely free paraphrase gives the exact idea of the passage. In which Paul contrasts the present body with the next; longs to lay down the one and assume the other, which he calls *eternal*, and *on the assumption of which* he would find himself present with the Lord; and recognises nothing as intervening between quitting the one body and finding himself in the other and eternal one, the investiture with which was essential to his being present with the Lord. The eighth verse is the logical conclusion of the whole.

Now remembering that scripture recognises no perfectly disembodied state, and only two bodies, and that the next is the resurrection body, we are again conducted to the same conclusion to which Matt. xxiii. and 1 Cor. xv. brought us, and are again reminded of the grand importance of the resurrection, which is a more capital doctrine in scripture than in our modern systems of theology.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—The first edition of this work is all sold or scattered abroad; but another edition will be ready in a few days. Continue to send us your orders.

AFFECTIONATE PREACHING.

There is something in an affectionate statement of gospel truths peculiarly calculated to find its way to the heart. Christianity is a religion of sympathy. It is founded on the principal of human wretchedness. It meets man in every species of sorrow and affliction. It takes him by the hand when deserted by human supports. It pierces the clouds which throw a melancholy gloom over the path of life; and opens before 'the way-worn traveller,' a 'hope full of immortality.' Let us reflect upon this peculiarity of our holy religion, and consider what an advantage it gives us in our public addresses. By far the greater part of our congregations are suffering in one way or other. We cannot enter a family, and be permitted to know what is passing within it, without perceiving that there is a worm corroding the root of their comforts—some poisoned arrow drinking up their spirits—some intolerable burden subduing their strength. To such, how suitable is the invitation of a compassionate Saviour, 'Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will refresh you!' How appropriate is the character of the great High Priest who is 'touched with the feeling of our own infirmities!' To such, how adapted are the consolations of the Spirit, the promises of the Gospel, and the resting place of the saints! To overlook such circumstances, and to discuss abstract truths in a cold and formal heartless manner—O what a loss of opportunity! what a mocking of human misery! what direliction of duty! what a prostitution of office! what a fearful responsibility! Let us, my reverend brethren, pray for the heart of a shepherd—for 'bowels of compassion.' Let us take the sufferer by the hand, and conduct him to the Saviour! Let us lead him to the wells of salvation! Let us pour the healing balm into his bleeding heart, and assure him that there is One who sympathises with his sorrows, and who 'is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him.' Forgive my earnestness, and permit me to say, that *Christ is the only subject* which meets the wants and wretchedness of man; Christ, in his person and offices; Christ, in his doctrines and atonement; Christ, in his spirit and in his government; in his love, his condescension, his mercy, his salvation,—as the guide and support and comfort of his people; as their Redeemer, their Friend, their Advocate, their Forerunner, their Representative; the Fountain of all blessedness, both in time and eternity!—*Jarram.*

FOREIGN NEWS.

The recent arrivals from Europe bring deeply interesting intelligence. A synopsis of it in the Ledger, of this city, commences by saying, "The whole of continental Europe seems ready to burst into *one general conflagration.*" Such is the truth: and we have long looked, and are still looking for a "*conflagration*" there, such as will leave in the shade all the horrors Europe has ever witnessed. How soon, or how rapidly it may manifest itself we do not know; but we believe it is at the door, and cannot long be delayed.

The "*intervention*" of France in the affairs of Italy, which we noticed in the last Examiner, turns

out to be, it seems, a mere *hypocritical pretence* of helping to maintain the liberties of Italy against Austria, while the *real* design was to *restore* the Pope and maintain him in power. But the Italians were not deceived by the shameful movement of French *republicanism* as the following items from Rome will show.

On the 27th, the Constitutional Assembly resolved to adhere to their resolution of opposing the entrance of the French.

Orders have been issued to undermine Milan, on the approach of the French to the side of the seaboard. Cannon are planted on the road and the gates and streets that lead to Cevita Vecchia. The long cornered gallery erected by Pope Borgia, between the castle of St. Angelo and the Vatican Palace, has been blown up with powder, and the materials used to block up the entrances to the city.

A deputation of the Central Committee had protested against the invasion, and informed General Oudinott that Rome would resist his entrance by force, and blow up the Quirinal, the Vatican, and St. Peter's which were already undermined.

The French General replied, that his instructions were imperative, and that he would enter Rome by force, if not quietly received.

The following is a proclamation addressed by the Roman Government to the French who invaded their territory.

"Frenchmen, your ancestors brought us liberty, but you bring us slavery. In destroying the Roman republic you will destroy your own. Oh shame! You stood by during the misfortune of Lombardy. You had not a word of consolation for the fall of Piedmont. Your venal writers calumniate the heroic efforts of Hungary.

"On this very day, with an impudent mockery, you come to destroy Roman liberty. Are you, indeed, soldiers? If you are, choose a foe worthy of your courage. Do not come to defy the rising strength of a petty State. If you wish to combat against republican arms, cease to be republicans yourselves. Frenchmen, answer truly, whom do you wish to restore to power? Are they the priests? That hereditary race who have caused so much blood to flow, and occasioned so many woes to France herself? Study your own history, and you will see what you are about to do for us. We have an implacable hatred of sacerdotal domination. You wish to impose it on us by force. You are about to place us on a level with the Chinese. Frenchmen! before undertaking a detestable work, ask of the sky above you, and it will answer that it has been polluted by sacerdotal iniquities in all ages. Ask your youth and our women, and learn an uninterrupted tale of seduction, of debauchery, and of venality. Ask of our farmers for whom they have labored. They will answer, for the priests! Ask to whom belongs the fifth part of the State. To the priests! Ask to whom belong the most luxurious abodes, for whom are the most exquisite delicacies, and who are those obeyed by thousands of menials. The reply will still be — the priests! the priests! Frenchmen, your mission is the work of hell!"

The secret of the whole movement is, we think, the French President has sold himself to Papacy and papal priests; and hence will soon find his fate sealed, as all others will who "worship the image of the beast;" for, they are to drink the "wine of the wrath of God that is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation."

The following items we extract from the remarks of the Ledger on "European Politics." Speaking of the present conflicts in Europe, it says:—

"The Hungarians rose, almost as one man, in defence of national independence; and being aided by Polish Generals and Polish troops, they have driven the reactionary Austrians out of their country, and are now within a short distance of Vienna. The Austrian government, thus menaced, has called to its aid the grand enemy of all popular governments in Europe, Russia. This step has lifted the veil and thrown off the mask, and proclaimed to the people in all Western and Southern Europe, that no faith can be safely kept with Princes, and that their only road to their natural rights is through republicanism."

Thus there seems likely to be a "rushing of the nations:" but we wait for the developements, knowing that the Kingdom of Christ is at hand.

THE NEW WORK.—"*The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by H. H. DOBNEY," Baptist Minister, England, is the very best work on the End of the Wicked we have ever seen. It is written in the kindest spirit, and cannot give offence to any. Though kind, it is clear, uncompromising and overwhelming against the popular theory of natural immortality and endless misery; and demonstrating, so far as argument can do it, that *utter destruction* is the punishment of wicked and unrepenting men. Put this work into the hands of all who will read, not forgetting ministers of all sects and parties. It contains 286 pages, 12mo. Price 75 cts. bound, or 50 in paper covers; this last, only, can be sent by mail. For *each* dollar, current money, sent us free of expense, we will send *two* copies of it and *pre-pay* the postage on them; or, we will send *three* without pre-paying the postage where the Post Masters will allow them to be thus sent. Where the work is ordered to be sent by express, or private hands, on the bound also, *one-third* discount will be made to those who purchase six or more copies, if current money is sent us. Cash, always, with the order.

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in

BOSTON, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 37 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store.

LOWELL, Mass., of Eld. M. Bates, Chapel St., one door above Elm.

ALBANY, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, No. 344 Broadway.

NEW YORK CITY, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.

ROCHESTER, N Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., of Ransom Hicks, No 215 Pine St.

All orders sent us, at Philadelphia, Pa., for Dobney, to be forwarded by *Express*, will be sent to New York City, without expense, going north, east or west

Our "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh, Eld. Bates, Geo. T. Adams, Dr. Burdell, and Ransom Hicks.

PRICE OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS AT EXAMINER OFFICE.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, (New Hymn Book,) 128 pages, 24mo., paper covers, *15* cts. each; ten copies for $1 00; for $8 00, one hundred copies.

SIX SERMONS, Quarto, 16 pages, (newspaper postage, only, when sent by mail,) $1.00 per forty copies. No further discount can be made on either of the above works.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, bound, *seventy five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifty*.

SIX SERMONS, 18mo., 120 pages, bound, *twenty five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifteen*.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, bound in plain morocco, *twenty-five* cts.

On the three last named works *one-third* discount will be made to those who buy to *sell again*: and we will make a still further discount of *twenty per cent.* to those who send us twenty dollars, current money, at one time. This offer is designed to enable those who may wish it, to keep a depository of these works, and to cover their expense for transportation. The names of such we will place in the list of depositories, in the Examiner.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1849. No. 7.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

TRUE WESLEYAN—IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW No. III.

Mr. Lee argues that "the soul, the rational man, cannot be the body, nor any part of it, as is proved from the identity which the mind is conscious of maintaining from the dawn of existence to life's final close."

"The soul, or rational man," then, according to Mr. Lee's philosophy, is "*not the body, nor any part of it!*" Mr. Lee is not so good a philosopher as Paul. See 1 Cor. xii: 12—26. Here Paul teaches us that "the *body is one*"—it is a unit, but "hath many members." Again, he says, "the body is not one member, but many." He teaches us that the "hand," the "foot," the "ear," the "eye," are all members of the body; hence he says—"But now are they many members, yet but one body." The truth is, all the parts of man are members or attributes of his body; and if you take away any one, you make a schism in it. But Mr. Lee says—"the soul is not the body, nor any part of the body." Of course, then, according to Paul's reasoning, it—"the soul"—can say to the "hand, I have no need of thee:" to the foot, the ear, the eye; and, indeed, the whole body, I have no need of any of you! for I am not of the body!!

Mr. Lee speaks of "the soul" as the "rational man:" then there is a man connected with the "soul," which is not "rational!" Such is the confusion of this Babel of theology and philosophy.

But if it be true that "the soul is not the body, nor any part of it," then no injury or disease of the body can disturb the functions or powers of the soul; for the reason that it "is no part of the body." Let us throw this into the syllogistic form, thus:

1. That which "is no part of the body" cannot be injured or deranged by disease of the body.

But the "soul is no part of the body."

Ergo—It can never be injured or deranged by disease of the body.

This is Mr. Lee's position; but is it a true one? We shall soon see. What does Mr. Lee mean by "the soul, the rational man?" He doubtless means the *mind*. Is it true that no disease of the body can injure or derange the *mind*? *This is not true*, as we shall see in the course of these articles. In view of all the *facts* in the case, we are compelled to come to the following conclusion:

2. Whatever is "a part of the body" can be deranged or destroyed by disease of the body.

But the "soul"—the mind—can be deranged, &c. by disease of the body.

Ergo—The mind is a part of the body.

I shall leave this part of the question just now, for the purpose of examining Mr. Lee's great argument on "*consciousness*."

Let it be remembered then, that Mr. Lee predicates "*identity and self-consciousness*" *of the immortal soul or mind*, and not of "the body, nor any part of the body." Mr. Lee argues that as the body, in all its parts, is the subject of constant waste and decay, it cannot be the subject of identity and consciousness.

Here we have both sides of the question fully before us.

1. The soul is immortal—our identity and consciousness are always the same—these, therefore, are attributes of the soul, which is not subject to any change.

Let us look at this a little. Mr. Lee says—"consciousness is that notice which the mind takes of its own operations and modes of existence." This may be true in a qualified sense, but it is not susceptible of the use Mr. Lee wishes to make of it. Mr. Lee contends that the mind is *immortal*; if so, it cannot be deranged, diseased, destroyed. If Mr. Lee's position, therefore, be a true one, a man should never lose his identity nor consciousness. Is this a fact? Far from it; for there are many cases on record of persons losing their identity, and becoming the subject of *double consciousness*. Why is this, if consciousness be an attribute of an "immortal soul." Mr. Lee says—"we cannot say consciousness is that notice which the brain takes of its own operations and modes of existence." But, why can we not? Can Mr. Lee give a reason? When the skull is fractured, and pressure is made upon the brain, *all consciousness is suspended*. Why is this, if consciousness be not connected with the brain? If consciousness were an attribute of a mind immortal, this phenomenon would not follow from such a cause.

Mr. Lee says—"the brain is not the subject of this consciousness of identity." Suppose this were so, what would it prove? Would it prove that the brain is not the seat of consciousness? Is Mr. Lee, apart from the knowledge of the fact, conscious of having any brain? Does this prove that he has none? Is he conscious of having a heart, whose office is to propel the blood? Can he tell by his consciousness that his heart is the centre of the circulation? The brain may be the seat of personal identity, and give rise to consciousness without our being able, by reflecting on our modes of existence, to determine its location. But, the truth is, if we can determine anything by consciousness, we should certainly be induced to localize it in the brain. And, so far as we are conscious of our own identity and thoughts, we refer

them to the brain; and learn, by reflecting upon our own feelings and sensations, to refer them to the encephalon. Mr. Lee contends he has an immortal soul: is he conscious of such a possession? Is he conscious of having an incorruptible mind, and does he know, by reflection, that this is the seat of his identity and consciousness?

2. But Mr. Lee urges the continual change of the particles of the body, as an objection to consciousness being dependant upon organization.

This argument is not new—I have met with it frequently before. A person at the age of seventy may have changed ten times; and there are corresponding changes in the mind. Every organ, of course, is subject to the same waste and renovation. This applies to all parts, external and internal—the hardest and softest. It applies to the heart and blood vessels generally. And yet all the organs preserve their identity and sameness of organization, unless diseased. The process of absorption and deposition is so gradual, so admirable, so complete, that the organization retains its identity. In childhood this process is very rapid, but *deposition exceeds absorption;* hence the increase in bulk, in size, &c. This excess of deposition continues till maturity; after which, the process of waste and renovation are about equal, till old age supervenes, when the waste exceeds that of renovation; and the man, unless previously cut off by disease, gradually wears out, and sinks into the grave. In this case, there is a second childhood; the mind again becomes imbecile and childish.

In childhood, but few mental powers are manifested; but, as the individual approaches puberty, new powers come into play; and, when manhood is attained, we see a corresponding change in the mind. The judgment is now mature, and the mental powers acute. But in old age all this is reversed —a second childhood obtains, and imbecility reigns! And, as we have before observed, there is a corresponding change in the organization. The brain is shrunk, and the mental fires decay. But now let us look on the other side of this interesting question. Suppose Mr. Lee's argument to be correct, then it follows, *the mind being immortal*, that every incident, every impression, every feeling, every thought, must be retained; memory must be perfect; nothing can be forgotten. If the mind be immortal, memory must be immortal. If the mind be deathless, the memory must be deathless. If the mind be incorruptible, the memory must be incorruptible. We defy Mr. Lee to evade this. But what are the facts in the case? The memory is defective—it is neither immortal, deathless, nor incorruptible! And yet it is an attribute of the mind. But if the mind—the soul—the spirit, be immortal, not an idea—not an impression—not an incident—not an event—not a word—not an act—not a feeling—not a sentiment—should be erased from its tablet! Get over this who can: Mr. Lee cannot. When Mr. Lee explains how partial memory, partial or total insanity, partial or total idiocy can be reconciled with the idea of mental immortality, it will be time enough to bestow upon his difficulty, concerning identity, additional arguments.

In conclusion, Mr. Lee says, speaking of the "conscious-smitten sinner," "I am guilty; not my feet, not my hands, not my brains, not any part of my material body, but I, myself, am guilty: it is not my body, but myself; and this I, this self, denotes the thinking moral man—the soul, which, of course, cannot be the body, nor any part of it."

Let us change this, and see how it reads—thus: "I am guilty; not my feet, not my hands, not my brains," nor my *immortal soul*, "but myself," &c. According to Mr. Lee's philosophy, "*the soul*" alone, by which he means that which is *immaterial*, is guilty before God and man. How, then, will you punish the guilty one? If the soul be immaterial, it is intangible, and can never be brought to trial before any human tribunal. Why punish the body for the sins of the immortal soul? This is punishing the innocent for the guilty. According to Mr. Lee, the body is no more guilty than the telegraph wires, along which a slander is transmitted! Why hang a man if this be true? Why punish him in any way? His immortal soul is alone guilty—"not his body, nor any part of his body!" not even his "brains!" I would ask Mr. Lee if a man can be guilty without brains? And, if not, why this *puerile* argument? *I affirm that* MAN *in the* CONCRETE, *and not in the* ABSTRACT, *is guilty.* Not his feet, hands, brain, nor "soul," but the man as such; and in this light he is held responsible by all law, human and divine. J. T. W.

A REVIEW—IMMORTALITY.

NO. IV.

Mr. Lee's last philosophical argument is that, "*nothing but spiritual good can satisfy the human mind—the phenomena developed in the progress of the body and mind, prove them not to be identical.*"

Let us analyze the proposition. And,

1st. "Nothing but spiritual good can satisfy the human mind." How does this harmonize with Mr. Lee's previous declarations?—with mental philosophy?—and with the facts in the case?

It does not harmonize with Mr. Lee's previous remarks upon the "essential properties of matter." He has given us what *he* conceives to be these "essential properties," and, of course, *all other properties* in *his estimation*, belong to spirit. How then can he say, *consistently*, that "*nothing* but *spiritual* good can satisfy the human mind?" Amativeness is either a property of matter, or spirit. According to Mr. Lee's theory, it cannot be a property of matter; and must, therefore, be a property of spirit! Does *it* desire "spiritual good?" And we might make the same enquiry about a variety of the *elements* of the "human mind."

Neither does it harmonize with mental philosophy. The mind is made up of a number of elements, some of which relate to things physical, others to things of a moral character, and others to intellectual objects. *Facts* are opposed to his proposition, for the "human mind," as is demonstrated by observation, has a multiplicity of desires which do not relate to "spiritual good."

2d. Who asserts that "the body and mind are identical?" No man in his senses! Vision is an element of the "human mind," but vision and the body are not "identical." The *brain, medulla oblongata, medulla spinalis*, and the *nerves* departing from these centres, belong to the body—they are organs of the body; and motion, sensation, feeling, sentiment, and intellect are *functions* of these organs, and *attributes* of the body. The *cerebrum* is a part of the man—the organ of *thought*, &c., thought is an *attribute* of the man, and an *element* of mind. Matter is thus endowed with *affective, moral*, and *intellectual functions*.

"The spirituality of the human soul," says Mr. Lee, "may be inferred from the nature of its desires," &c. This only carries us back to a former point, so we will leave it and proceed. Mr. Lee says, "All men desire happiness," and that "the greater portion seek it where it is not to be found."

Indeed! One would suppose, if the mind were immortal, that *its* desires would all be *pure*, properly directed, and only centered on that which is good; and that men would "seek happiness" only where it *could* be found.

But Mr. Lee explains by saying, "the reason is, they seek it in the gratification of their *animal propensities*." Are there "animal propensities," "properties," or attributes of matter? If not, what argument is there in all this?

The fact is, all Mr. Lee says under this head is in perfect harmony with our view of the subject; but altogether incompatible with the immortality of the mind.

Man finds his happiness in all the physical, moral, and intellectual objects to which he has *elements* of mind adapted. These *elements* of mind inhere in organized material organs. And therefore, although "man" be "only matter," "compounded of the elements of the material world," the "centres of attraction" are just as numerous as the *elements* of his mind. And therefore, "that matter (*man organized of matter*) should seek" the gratification of all its powers, whether this be in "fountains of spiritual bliss," or in objects of sense, is neither "absurd" nor "unphilosophical;" but, on the contrary, in perfect accordance with "its own essential laws," and the "essential properties of its own nature."

Mr. Lee says, "The fact that the world of matter never did, and never can satisfy the desires of the human soul, is one of the clearest proofs that the soul is not itself matter." Now, in my estimation, this "proof" amounts to no "proof" at all. Let us see: "The fact that the world of matter" *ever has*, and *ever will* (in man's present state) "satisfy the desires" of a *majority* of "human souls, is one of the clearest proofs that the soul is itself matter." Now, what has Mr. Lee gained by his so-called "proof?" Just nothing at all! So it is not true that "the world in any and all its forms, cannot satisfy the desires of *one* human soul." For the *majority of mankind* are satisfied with "the world in any and all its forms of pleasure, without regard to the "spirit world." "Give it," (the soul) says Mr. L., "all the elements of earth, sea, and air, moulded into every possible form, and it would grasp the whole, and thirst and famish still, and pant for higher bliss," &c. This is contrary to facts, for multitudes of men, "who have their portions in this life," neither desire nor seek for "higher bliss." And, if they "grasp the whole, and thirst and famish still," it is for more of the *same nature*. Tell me that such a soul is "immortal?" "The reason is," to use the language of Mr. Lee, "the soul is matter"—not "spirit." "Were it" spirit, all its desires would be in harmony with its nature.

Mr. Lee says, "It" (spirit) "originally came from God, and hence can be happy in God alone, as God dwells in us, and we in God." Let us try this statement: *matter* "originally came from God, and hence can be happy in God alone, as God dwells in us, and we in God." This is just as good an argument as Mr. Lee's, and both may pass for what they are worth; but so far as the "*origin*" of them is concerned, the reader can see that if one be good evidence, so is the other.

Mr. Lee asks, "But does God dwell in matter, and matter in God?" We reply, that God "fills heaven and earth;" and as the heavens and the earth are matter, "God dwells in matter." He fills the vast universe. It has not inaptly been said that "his centre is everywhere, and his circumference is nowhere." And so far as it respects "matter dwelling in God," I will say that *man* is matter; and "*in* God he *lives* and *breathes*, and has his *being*." "Matter," then, in the form and capacity of man, "can have fellowship with the Father and the Son;" "can have communion with the eternal spirit;" can drink joys from the fountain" of all joy. Mr. Lee bases another argument on "the desire of knowledge in connection with the capacity of the mind to improve."

This argument will only hold good in relation to a *part of mankind*, for there are many who have neither the "desire" nor the "capacity" to improve. It is, therefore, of no avail, for either immortality is hereditary, or it is not; if it is, *all men* have it; but, if it is not, *none* have it.

But Mr. Lee admits that "the soul commences its career without knowledge." Now, only think of an "immortal mind"—self-conscious, self-intelligent, possessing all the attributes of intelligence, knowledge, and wisdom, "commencing its career without knowledge!" The very idea is absurd! But Mr. Lee says, "its *capacity* furnishes the basis of the argument." This merely brings us back to those who have no "capacity to learn," and thus the argument fails.

Mr. Lee has foiled himself—he has precipitated himself overboard, and carried all his arguments with him! Hear him: "*The mind, in its present state, is dependant upon the* BODILY ORGANS *for primary ideas!*!" This admission is fatal to his whole theory! What is the meaning of it? Why, it means this—*that the* "IMMORTAL MIND" *is* DEPENDANT *upon* MATTER "FOR PRIMARY IDEAS!" Mind dependant upon matter for ideas! "Ideas" do not "inhere in mind," then, as Mr. Lee first taught us. They must "inhere" in matter, for mind is "dependant upon the bodily organs for *primary* ideas." Yes, and I will add, for *all* "ideas," "primary" and secondary. But Mr. Lee limits this to "the *present* state." Very well, that will answer our purpose; but how does he know but the same arrangement may obtain in the next "state?" But what and where are "the bodily *organs*, upon which "the soul is dependant for primary ideas?". Mr. Lee mentions two—the eye and the ear; but these are not all. The *brain* is full of them. The "soul is dependant" on the brain "for primary ideas." Now, friend Lee, let us shake hands and be good friends, for we have met at the same focal point.

I hope that we shall hear nothing more about materialism from that quarter; but, that henceforth, life, mind, intelligence, all the mental phenomena, will be predicated upon organization; and that eternal life, immortality, and incorruptibility will be proclaimed through Jesus, who is "the resurrection and the life." J. T. W.

ALL LETTERS to the Assistant Editor should be addressed, No. 63 Ogden St., Philadelphia, Pa.—*Please remember this.*

FUTURE STATES.

By Rev. Reginald Courtenay, A. M.

(Continued from page 87.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

We will now turn to a passage on which great stress is laid by nearly every writer upon the subject of the intermediate state, though they do not all agree as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. In order to confute the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, our Lord asks, "As touching the dead that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err."

"Our Saviour's argument," says Dr. Jortin, in his Doctrine of a Future State, "in the opinion of several, seems rather directly to prove a future state, or another life, or rather the permanency of the soul, than a resurrection by which a dead man shall become a living man again. But as the Sadducees, who denied a resurrection, denied also that the soul was a living principle distinct from the body, our Lord, say they, by proving the permanency of the soul, or of the person, overset the foundation of their pernicious doctrine. But it seems most probable* that our Lord intended to convince the Sadducees of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; and it was a good *argumentum ad hominem*. Abraham, in your opinion, is dead and perished; but God calls himself the God, that is the protector and rewarder of Abraham, after he was dead; therefore he will raise him again to a state of happiness. What could a Sadducee have replied to this? He could not say that God might reward the *soul* of Abraham, without raising him from the dead. By doing so, he must have given up [*part of*] his own system.

"This argument of our Saviour, *though it will not prove an intermediate state of happiness*, yet, on the other hand, will not prove the sleep, or insensibility, or non-existence of the soul during that interval."

This candid avowal of Jortin's has proved by no means satisfactory to most other advocates of an intermediate consciousness. Dr. Bull says, "the Sadducees denied the subsistence of the spirits of men after death, and therefore denied the resurrection of their bodies: and if they could have been convinced of the former, they would readily have acknowledged the latter also." And this view has been generally adopted by writers on the same side, who hold, as Dr. Jortin has stated, that our Lord's argument proves rather the permanency of the soul, than the resurrection of the body.

Yet nothing can well be more plain, than that our Lord's argument was intended to prove the resurrection of the body; and even if we were meanly to consider it merely as an *argumentum ad hominem*, intended for the Sadducees alone,† it would be totally inconclusive, if it went to prove the consciousness of the dead;—if they were to be regarded as experiencing God's protection, as being in fact *not* dead, but living.

It is absurd to say that the Sadducees would allow that their antagonist,—for as such they esteemed Jesus,—had proved the resurrection of the dead, by proving the permanency or consciousness of the soul. The permanency of the soul was matter of popular heathen belief, as well as a favorite philosophical tenet; and yet it "seemed a thing incredible to them that God should raise the dead;" a thing which merited to be received with mockery. Men who have just been defeated on one point, are not therefore the more likely to yield another, which is not necessarily dependent on the former.

The words which God spake to Moses at the bush, afford, as we maintain, no proof whatever of resurrection, except on the supposition that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and other departed servants of God, are *not now* experiencing the truth of God's assurance that He would be their God. For if this promise be realized to them now, their resurrection can be in nowise necessary to its fulfilment. If we believe that the Almighty, in order to verify His words, not only took the disembodied souls of these patriarchs into his especial keeping, but also conferred on them such consciousness and bliss as to prove to them that he was still as truly their God as before, we entirely lose our proof, "as touching the dead, *that they rise*."

There would never have been any dispute about the import of this "famous passage," had not men been perversely bent upon discovering in it a demonstration of that intermediate consciousness to which it is decidedly hostile.

Our Lord's argument is evidently this: All dead men (or at least all who have died in faith) will rise again from the dead. For those dead men, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will rise from the dead. For God has declared himself to be their God,—their shield, and their exceeding great reward,—and he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. *Now* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are as yet numbered among the dead: but they must surely *live* again, to rejoice in the God of the living: or else the word of God would be unfulfilled. And to live again they must *rise* again. To maintain that He is the God of those dead men who are departed out of this world, would not only destroy the proof of the resurrection, but confound the distinction between the dead and the living, invariably maintained in Scripture, and nowhere more plainly than in this passage at the bush. When the disciples came to seek Jesus at the sepulchre wherein his body had been laid, the angel of the Lord said unto them, "Why seek ye living among the dead? he is not here, but he is *risen*:" implying that until Jesus rose he was not living. And so Isaiah said long before, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they *arise*." But it is needless to multiply examples.

It may perhaps be said that the words of our Lord, recorded by St. Luke, do remove the distinction just contended for, between the living and the dead. "For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for *all live unto him*." If we suppose this to mean, that in God's sight there is no such thing as death, we again lose our proof of the resurrection of the dead. "Unto him," with whom

*Might he not have said, It is most certain?

† That it was by no means intended only for the Sadducees may be fairly gathered from the fact, that it proved convincing to the common people; who were "astonished at his doctrine;" as well as to certain of the scribes, who would scarcely have deemed Jesus to have "spoken well," had not his argument been convincing to their own minds.

a thousand years are as one day, and all future eternity is present, all they may be said to "live," who, when their momentary hiding in the grave is past, will live for all eternity. They may for a while be unconscious of God: but God is not unmindful of them. He has appointed a set time, at which he will remember them, and have a desire unto the work of his hands. Their unconsciousness, for however long an interval, does not falsify the divine word. If our Lord was the God of Abraham, while he slept through one night in unconsciousness, He is the God of Abraham no less though he sleep through ten thousand years.* "O God, Thou art *my God*," the faithful Jew might say, "*for ever* will I trust in Thee! Thou wilt not leave nor forsake me. But shall thy loving kindness be shown in the grave, Thy faithfulness in destruction? Not so: for thou art not the God of the dead. Thy power, Thy truth, Thy faithfulness, shall be manifested in redeeming my soul from the grave; and then wilt thou be indeed my God, when thou hast given this mortal immortality."

And wherefore did God please to declare himself Abraham's God? "Here," says St. Paul, "we have no continuing city, but we seek that which is *to come*." Abraham too, "sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And these patriarchs, we read, died in faith, "desiring a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called *their God*, FOR he hath prepared for them a city."

The admission of Abraham, and of all believers into this city is as yet future; for God hath not built it in Hades below, in the present dwelling-place of the dead, but prepared it in heaven above, for the blessed and merciful who shall inherit the kingdom at the Last Day. When the heavens and earth have passed, it shall come down out of heaven from God, who will then, and not before, have His tabernacle with men, and dwell among them. Then, and not while they are dead, "God himself shall be with them; AND BE THEIR GOD."

We may now turn to the consideration of a passage on which far more stress is laid, than on our Lord's confutation of the Sadducees,—and certainly with much better reason: the parable of Dives and Lazarus. The entire weight of the argument in favor of an intermediate consciousness, to be derived from this parable, depends of course upon the supposition that it is intended to contain a *revelation* concerning the unseen world. But it is an objection to this at the outset, that *no other* of our Lord's parables contains a revelation, except in respect of its secondary meaning. The parable, for instance, of the wheat and tares conveys indeed a revelation, in respect of the gathering of the elect, and the fiery destruction of the wicked; but none whatever concerning husbandry. It might be urged however with truth, that in the parable of Dives and Lazarus even the primary meaning relates to the unseen world, to spiritual things, which is not the case in any other parable; and that to suppose it to convey a revelation is merely to suppose that, in common with all, or most other parables, it conveys, in its primary meaning, a statement of actual, or at least of possible events. All the other parables, it must be admitted, contain statements of possible events: but it is nevertheless highly improbable and it is not generally believed, that they speak of actual facts. The mode of instruction by parables was customary before it was adopted by our Lord; and it is employed in Syria at this day, without any intention of conveying information otherwise than by the secondary meaning: and if the parables are in general true also in the primary meaning, this is merely because parabolic illustrations are best borrowed from the most common and familiar events available for the purpose.

We are then reduced to the alternative of supposing, either that this parable contains *far more* than any other,—in conveying a revelation in its primary meaning;* *or somewhat less*, in speaking of things which could not happen, where other parables speak of things which very probably did not happen; and concerning which things, (whether they had happened or not) our Lord had no intention to convey any new information whatever. Which of the two should we prefer?

Some have preferred the former, because the Jews, as they maintain, must necessarily have so understood the parable; inasmuch as, in our Lord's time, they commonly believed that "the souls of the faithful, when they die, are by the ministry of angels conducted into Paradise." "If this had been an erroneous opinion of the Jews," says Bishop Bull, "doubtless our Saviour would never have given any the least countenance to it." But let us consider whence the Jews derived this notion of a Paradise, or Garden of Eden. Nothing is said in their Scriptures of any such place—except that from which Adam was expelled. Either they expected a return to this, as is most probable, or to some place, answering to the Elysian fields of the Greeks,—and *as unreal*. But the Paradise of Adam, and the Paradise of the Book of Revelations, is the fit place of abode, not for mere spirits, but for actual living men, for embodied souls.

And we must consider the details of the parable itself, in order to judge whether our Lord intended to confirm the cabalistic notions of the Jews, and authenticate them as containing a doctrine worthy of general acceptation.

Whatever expectations we might have been inclined to entertain beforehand, the parable *cannot* contain a revelation. For it is altogether inconsistent with what we know both from Scripture and observation, concerning the intermediate state, and also with what is revealed concerning the Day of Judgment. In the intermediate state men are disembodied. How then can we literally understand the petition of Dives, that Lazarus might "dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool his tongue?" *Whence* the water, the finger, the tongue?

* It should be observed that, for aught we know, a few moments of unconsciousness *may* occur not unfrequently in the course of the waking hours of every one. There are some mental and nervous affections in which consciousness is suspended for considerable intervals, and yet, when consciousness returns, the current of ideas flows on as if no break had taken place. Yet God ceaseth not to be the God of these persons. Bishop Butler and others admit that the mind may be unconscious for a time.

* It may be fairly questioned, whether a passage thus conveying, as is supposed, *a double revelation*, ought to be called a parable.

Are we to go to the length of supposing that men are to occupy temporary bodies before the resurrection? and that on their departure from this world they shall have a local, as well as mental, existence? And how can we place *all* the righteous *literally* in Abraham's bosom? Yet the parable makes this the position of Lazarus! Dives "seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom;" and beholding him there (and, as it appears, seeing no one else,) begs Abraham to send him to his aid.

Whence too the solicitude of Dives about his brethren, when in "the land where all things, (*at least* all *earthly* things,) are forgotten?" How can Dives pray to Abraham for help, when in the land, wherein is no work, nor device, nor knowledge?

Dives we are told was in hell, called Hades, indeed, but represented as a place of torment and of flame. But are the flames of hell, whatever kind of torment the words may portend, *already* burning? Is there another hell beside that to which the wicked shall be consigned, when, as we are told in a passage not parabolical, the words shall be uttered, "Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*," inquired the evil spirits of Jesus. *Their* time then has not yet arrived. And the "angels that sinned" are simply enchained in Hades, and reserved for the judgment of the Great Day. Is there a *separate and previous* hell, for the wicked of human birth? At the end of the world, we know, they will be punished along with evil spirits, in the fire prepared *for the latter*. Let us rather believe that the meeting of the blessed with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with the general assembly and church of the firstborn, and with the spirits of just men made perfect, and with an innumerable company of angels; and the meeting also of the cursed with legions of evil spirits, will take place at the end of the world.

From the occurrences which will *then* take place, the imagery of this parable is borrowed; being merely, as it were, ante-dated, for the sake of the moral application. Its import will be best understood by considering the moral lesson which it is intended to convey. If men hear not Moses and the prophets, (and still more, if they disobey Christ and his apostles,) neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. No more forcible method of inculcating this truth could well be imagined, than by supposing a dialogue between a tormented sinner and the father of the faithful, concerning the sending a messenger back from the grave. If we are to accept the parable as a revelation, we must accept every part, every detail. We must suppose it to contain a precisely accurate description of Hades, and a correct historical narrative. We must believe that all the wicked are tormented in flame, before the Judgment Day; that they have tongues which burn with heat; that they see Abraham and the rest of the righteous very plainly; that they (occasionally at least) are ignorant till Abraham informs them of it, of the great gulf between the regions of happiness and misery; that across this gulf they can converse with ease, etc.! and all this, though they have "gone down into silence;" and are in "a land of darkness, as darkness itself."

Some persons may reply, that the accounts which Scripture has given us of the world to come contain imagery of different and indeed opposite kinds: but that notwithstanding this, instead of *rejecting* those accounts, we are to understand them, in general, as literally as we can. An objection more specious than just. For though this principle of interpretation is to be applied to mere general descriptions, it is inapplicable to *narratives* like that in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in which the details cannot be true at all, unless in a literal sense. Several passages of Scripture represent the wicked as suffering from fire; which, when literally understood, implies the probable presence of light; while other accounts represent them as in outer darkness, as involved in "the blackness of darkness for ever." But there is no difficulty in reconciling these accounts by understanding the former to speak of the *sufferings* of the wicked, the latter of their being wholly cut off from Him who "is light," and in whom is "no darkness at all." But the tip of the finger, the water, the tongue, the flame, etc., in the parable, are either wholly imaginary, or are literally existing in Hades.

[To be continued.]

IS THIS AGE FINAL, OR PREPARATORY?

No. III.

MICAH III AND IV CONSIDERED.

We next turn to Micah. We commence chap. 3: 10. Let us remember the division of the Bible into chapters and verses is not inspiration, and often is so injudiciously done as to make the reader lose sight of the connection. We shall therefore read from Micah 3: 10, to 4: 4, without interruption. If the first part of the prophecy has been literally accomplished so will the remainder be.

"They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us. Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest. But in the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come, and say, come, and let us go up unto the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: FOR THE MOUTH OF THE LORD OF HOSTS HATH SPOKEN IT."

Not, "the people say it;" but, The Lord of hosts himself. Has "Zion" literally "been ploughed as a field? It has. If one part of the prophecy has had a literal fulfilment, then that is God's commentary with regard to the accomplishment of the remainder. It is most manifest that the part of this prophecy contained in the 4th chapter, has never had its fulfilment. To talk about its being fulfilled in the sayings of the professed church is to pervert the words of "the Lord of hosts;" and the absurdity

of applying this state of things to the new earth is too glaring to need a serious answer. To talk of rebuking strong nations afar off, after the earth has been burned, or melted by fire; and of beating swords into ploughshares, and spears into pruning hooks, after they have all been melted in the conflagration of the world, is a theory which might well be denominated spiritualism spiritualised, or, double refined.

The prophet goes on to say, verse 5, "All people," not of the nation of Israel, *i. e.* the Gentiles, "will walk in the name of his God," the true God whom they had not known, but now acknowledge agreeably to the prophecy of Isa. 54: 5, "The God of the whole earth *shall be called*;" and "we," gathered Israel, "will walk in the name of the Lord our God," whom we have ever had for our God, "for ever and ever."

The prophet then adds:

"IN THAT DAY, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even forever."

This corresponds exactly with Isa. 11th, that we have already examined; and to put the matter beyond all doubt, the prophecy adds, verse 8th:

"And thou O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come unto the daughter of Jerusalem."

AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT OF CHRISTIANS.

While christians in general are agreed as to *the fact*, they differ as to the circumstances with which that glorious time is to be ushered in. One opinion is, that it is to be gradually ushered in by the conversion of the world, and is only to be a spiritual reign of Christ, and the personal advent not to take place till the close of the millenium. This view may well be denominated the cry of "peace and safety;" for the nearer we approach the supposed time for that event, the less concern will sinners feel to deny themselves and take up their cross to follow Christ; because, they flatter themselves they shall live to see the millenium, and then, as all will some how or other be converted, they shall share in it without the trial that it would now cost them to be christians. It is not our present design to go into a labored refutation of that theory; we will only say—The Scriptures everywhere note the ushering in of that day with awful judgments on them who have "not obeyed the Gospel"—not their "conversion," but their destruction. While that theory in its legitimate influence, is producing the cry of "peace and safety, sudden destruction shall come upon them and they shall not escape." 1 Thess. 5: 2, 3, and 2 Thess. 1: 7–10.

Another opinion is, that that day will be ushered in with the burning of the world, the cutting off of every soul not then prepared for the inheritance of eternal life—the appearance of the new earth—the ending of probation to every soul of man, under whatever state of light or darkness they are living at the time; and that the period of all these great events is revealed in the prophetic numbers in the Bible. This last view is calculated to produce the greatest excitement when and where it is promulgated; and thus unfit men for sober reflection. The false views of the first class mentioned, prevent an alarm being given at all, and the erroneous views last mentioned produce so much alarm as to defeat the real benefit of an alarm. *Too much excitement* is as evil in its tendency as none at all; and the results of it are quite as fatal. Men under the influence of strong excitement act from the influence of their animal feelings, while their judgment finds very little chance to act at all; hence it is that when the excitement is past they are found without any settled principle; and if that which produced the excitement be an error, they relapse into a deeper state of insensibility than before; or, it is followed by a state of fanaticism worse than insensibility itself. Such has been the result with many of preaching that the world was to be burned in 1843 or '44.

ADVENT BEFORE MILLENIUM.

Neither our Lord nor his apostles have given us any intimation that such a state as that described in the texts we have quoted should be realised by his followers till his "*return.*" The hope of the church in those days was the return of their Lord. All they said and all they wrote shows this clearly. All our Lord's parables teach this, without exception. See the parable of the tares and wheat; the parable of the nobleman, &c. The design of the present age or dispensation, is clearly stated in Acts 15: 14. God is visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name; to fill up the number of the rulers, the "kings and priests" that he is determined to have at the opening of the next age, to sit with his Son on his throne. That high honor was first offered to the posterity of Jacob; but when they by transgression fell, through unbelief, the Gentiles were called to this honor, and the present age is allotted to bring this work to its completion; and when the number of chosen rulers is filled up, this age will end, and the next will open by sitting the Son of God on David's throne; and all his elect rulers, being made immortal at his coming and kingdom, will sit down with him; and with him will have power over the nations. Those nations that do not then submit are to be dashed in pieces.

ANSWER TO E. W. KNIGHT'S QUESTION.

In the Examiner for May, I noticed a question in which the writer wishes to know how and when Christ will bring about the great event of destroying the Devil and his works? Having always been taught to believe that the devil will exist as long as God exists, I shall attempt to give a brief answer, presuming that some one more qualified than I am will answer it more systematically than I can.

1st. Christ has said that he has finished the work which was given him to do—John 17: 4, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do;" 19: 30, "it is finished." These show plainly that Christ did finish the work which God gave him to do. If it were not so, I think he would not have said so. He was crucified and buried, arose and ascended into Heaven from thence he shall come to judge the world in righteousness. The question now arises, what is this judgment, and what the duration of the sentence?

2d. It is a separation of the just from the unjust —Rev. 22: 11, "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still; he that is holy let him be holy still." I sup-

pose E. W. K. will not dispute this point; therefore I will make a few remarks regarding the state of the righteous. I shall take the position that the punishment of the wicked will exist forever. Everlasting is a word which is attributed to God, which means no limited time: it is that duration which is always existing, Gen. 21: 33; Isa. 9: 6, 7; Psa. 41: 13; 90: 2; 145: 13; Dan. 4: 3. If this be so, I shall name a few passages of Scripture to show that the wicked shall exist everlastingly—Isa. 33: 14, "shall dwell with everlasting burnings." Dan. 12: 2, "to shame and everlasting contempt." Mat. 18: 8, "cast into everlasting fire;" 25: 46, "go away into everlasting punishment." Thess. 1: 7, "punished with everlasting destruction."

Eternal has the same meaning as everlasting: this is, I believe, agreed to by most if not all writers. I shall refer to a few texts to prove my point. Mark 3: 29, "but is in danger of eternal damnation." Jude 7, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." This proof, I think, is sufficient to establish the fact. I shall refer to three more to prove the whole. Matt. 12: 32, "shall not be forgiven him in this world, neither in the world to come." Mark 3: 29, "hath never forgiveness." Luke 12: 10, "it shall not be forgiven them." Here I shall leave the point, at present, hoping that some one more qualified than a poor mechanic will do justice to the question.

IRASBURG, *Vt.* B. B. JACKMAN.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The experience of the past two years has taught us that our price for a periodical of the character and mechanical execution of ours, is too low. There are monthly periodicals before us, containing less matter, on paper not equal to ours, having, it is true, a *cover*, which is of little use, and increases the postage, whose terms are *one* dollar per year; and one of them is *two* dollars. We need one hundred and sixty dollars more than we now have to complete the present volume. We have received forty new subscribers the past month; if we receive as many more monthly, to the end of this year, we shall then lack forty dollars to pay our printer. Under all the circumstances, we have come to the conclusion, that, after the present volume, we must put the Examiner at *one dollar* per year, instead of fifty cents as now. But if our subscription list amounts to two thousand we will publish it *twice each month*, the coming year, without any further charge than the one dollar. If we receive only one thousand subscribers by the first of January, for the next volume, we shall go on with the paper monthly. But, as both of the Editors are *absolutely* pennyless, we are frank to confess, that we cannot publish the paper any longer for the mere amount that pays the printer. We will now only add, if the paper lives, its conductors will utter their convictions of truth, untrammelled by friends or foes. We wish none to subscribe who are unwilling that we should do so; knowing that they will meet with disappointment if they do.

TRUE WESLEYAN AND BIBLE EXAMINER.—We call the attention of Br. Lee of the Wesleyan to a misconception we see in his editorial of "May 26." He uses the following language:—

"A discussion has been some time in progress in the Bible Examiner, between the Rev. John T. Walsh, and the Rev. Wm. H. Brewster. We have published several of Mr. Brewster's articles. The Examiner has intimated that we should have published both sides. We certainly had a right to publish all or part of Mr. Brewster's articles, and by so doing we lay ourselves under no obligation to publish the other side."

Now Br. Lee you certainly labor, we think, under a mistake in regard to us. The following is the language we used in the Examiner for March:—

"The Wesleyan has copied from the Examiner several of the articles of Bro. W. H. Brewster: but gave nothing of Br. Walsh's replies. This it had a perfect right to do, and we do not complain; though we would have been glad to see both sides in that paper as they are in our own."

Surely, Br. Lee, here is no "intimation that you *should* have published both sides." And here is a perfect concession of the "*right*" you claim. True, "we would have *been glad* to see both sides in" the Wesleyan; and who can blame us for that? And we would be equally *glad* to see Br. Walsh's "Review" of the articles "On Immortality" appear in that paper; but we have no idea of finding fault if they do not: indeed, we do not expect any such thing. We have ever had and still have a high opinion of the integrity and honesty of the Editor of the Wesleyan; and we sincerely hope he may not be betrayed in this controversy into that spirit of uncharitableness which characterises most of our opponents; and which makes a man an offender for a word—and a word, too, which he never uttered. This has been done by some of our opposers, and when the mistake was pointed out to them they have refused to correct it; but left their readers under the impression that we used language that we never employed. In the case of Br. Lee we believe it is simply a misconception of our language, which he will take pleasure in correcting.

CORRECTION.—In Br. Chittenden's letter, last Examiner, instead of "*withering* up" read *bristling* up. Also, in article "Christian Psalmody," instead of "$1 per *doz.* read $1 for *ten* copies.

THE ABOVE is a wood-cut likeness of the Editor of the Examiner. At present he will give no account of his life, only to say, he was born in Lebanon, N. H., December, 1796, and is, therefore, in his fifty-third year. If any wish a brief Phrenological description of him, they may find it below, given by the Assistant Editor, Dr. Walsh, for which he alone is responsible.

PHRENOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION AND OBSERVATIONS.—Mr. Storrs' physical and mental constitution is durable; he has considerable force and energy of character, with fortitude, firmness and perseverance. He thinks for himself, but is open to conviction; will not be forced, but may be persuaded. He is naturally confiding, but experience may have, to a considerable extent, corrected this predisposition to believe, confide in, or give credence to. He is a man of enlarged views, liberal sentiment, and a benevolent disposition. His object is *truth*, and this he strives to obtain, no matter at what sacrifice. He consults duty before expediency; and would sooner stand *alone* with truth, than go with the multitude and be in error; yet, he is not dogmatical in the advocacy of what he conceives to be the truth, but is rather persuasive, conciliatory and argumentative. He is a warm friend, a good companion, and an excellent counsellor.

He takes comprehensive views of things, examines both sides of all questions of a scriptural character, and decides according to the weight of evidence. While he uncompromisingly advocates what he believes to be truth, in opposition to this and past ages, he does not sit in judgment on his opponents, but leaves them in the hands of God, to whom they must give account, and unto whom they stand or fall.

Mr. Storrs, by his public preaching and writings, has given an interest and an impetus to the all-important subject of immortality, which it is not likely it will lose before it shall be realized at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, with all his saints. In the providence of God, he has been raised up to be the instrument of shedding on the darkness of the religious world, the bright beams and radiance of the truth, that "life and immortality were brought to light through the gospel." J. T. WALSH.

DR. LEES, Leeds, England. We have mailed the Examiner a second time for you: hope it has been received.

MISAPPREHENSION CORRECTED.—We have received a communication from two respected brethren who are actively engaged in preaching the second advent of Christ, and immortality through him, which we think best to give to our readers. We append a copy of the letter we wrote them in reply. We do this, because others may have misapprehended us as well as they.

"BR. STORRS:—We believe with you in the state of the dead and final end of the wicked. We read the Examiner, and there are many things in it that we like, and some we do not like. We do not like, (and there are many others that feel as we do in the matter,) the outrageous cant you gave the Millerites in your May number. We think, what does it mean? Brother, such things ought not so to be. We are what the world, the church, and Br. Storrs calls Millerites. Why are we thus? Is it not because we believe with Br. Miller that the Lord is soon coming? We never received a harder blow from a sworn enemy than you gave us; but by the grace of God we will bear it, though it came from Br. Storrs."

PHILADELPHIA, June 18th, 1849.

DEAR BRETHREN —— AND ——:—Your favor of the 12th inst. is just received: I take kindly your rebuke for what you call the "outrageous cant" I "gave the Millerites in the May number of the Examiner." I have read carefully over my remarks, in that paper, to which you refer, and must say, that I think you misapprehend me entirely. I have always endeavored to exculpate Mr. Miller from any participation in the views I hold on the State of the Dead and the End of the Wicked. At the time the May number of the Examiner was published, there was before me an article in the Northern Christian Advocate, headed "Annihilation of the Wicked;" in which it is stated, that "Mr. Storrs, and some others, have been for several years past teaching" this doctrine. It then goes on to state, that "this conceit" is "incorporated among the notions of Millerism." I wished again, as an act of justice, to bear my testimony against this doctrine being charged upon "Millerism," and therefore published what I did.

But you say, you are "what the world, the church, and Br. Storrs calls Millerites:" and you ask—"Why are we called thus?" You answer, "Is it not because we believe in common with Br. Miller, that the Lord is soon coming?" I reply *that* IS NOT what *I* call a Millerite: and I expressly stated in the article of May, that it was the "*peculiar*" views of Mr. Miller that I had abandoned several years ago. Whatever the "church" or "the world" may understand by Millerism, *I* understand it to have *three* PECULIARITIES, and nothing more: *viz.* "*Definite time* for the advent," and that time "not extending beyond A. D. 1847." That view I gave up in the winter of '44 and '45; and time has since demonstrated that I was right in so doing. The *two* other *peculiarities* of Millerism I gave up, one in the month of Feb. '44, and the other June '45. The three may be summed up thus. 1, "Definite time for the advent, not to go beyond '47." 2, "No return of the literal posterity of Jacob to the land wherein their fathers have dwelt." 3, "The earth all to be melted at the time of the advent, and none of its inhabitants left remaining upon it."

These three points constitute the *whole* of what *I call* Millerism, or "the *peculiarities* of Mr. Miller." The second personal advent of Christ—that advent pre-millennial—nigh, even at the door—the kingdom of God on earth, or the earth the inheritance of the saints—the earth to be renewed, Paradise restored, and all those kindred doctrines relating to the kingdom of God, are no part nor parcel of Millerism: they had a *distinct* existence from his theory, and before his views were published to the world. The fact that some who embraced his theory had no knowledge that these other points had been published, by English Literalists, years before they heard them from Mr. Miller, does not make them *really* any part of his *peculiarities:* they are not, and never were, any of his *peculiar* views. That which is peculiar to a person or thing is that which distinguishes it or him from others. The *three* points I have named are all that constitutes the peculiarities of Millerism.

The leaders in his theory did not like to retain the name of *Millerites* after 1843–4 passed by, though they gloried in being called so in those years. No sooner did the *time* pass away, and they commenced the work of organizing churches, than they assumed the name of *Adventiss;* thus showing they were unwilling to go forward under their former one, and so assumed that which is equally appropriate to all believers in the speedy return of Christ and his personal reign on earth, of whom there are many who never were Millerites. In assuming the name *Adventists* they wronged this latter class of believers; who thus became, in the public mind, identified with them; and they were as really a sect as any other. Why should they have left the name Millerite, by which they were every where known, to assume another without having given up one of Mr. Miller's peculiarities? Was it to cover their errors without "*confession?*" It certainly has that appearance, whatever might have been their design.

Some people call those "*Storrsites*" who believe there is no immortality to man out of Christ, and no future life except by a resurrection from the dead. I, of course, repudiate the appellation, and wish all others to do the same; but, suppose you had received and gloried in that name, as some did in the name of Millerites formerly; and suppose at length you became convinced that those *peculiar* views attributed to me were erroneous, and gave them up; would it follow that you were not believers in the advent—in the resurrection of the dead, &c., because I am a believer in those truths, which are not peculiar to me? And would you not think that people were peculiarly sensitive to find fault with you for saying you had renounced all Mr. Storrs' *peculiarities?* And would you not think them unjust to accuse you on this account of having "given up the advent faith?" Yet, such is the treatment I receive from the *leaders* in Mr. Miller's peculiarities.

Mr. Miller himself renounced, early in 1845, all connection with *me,* as may be seen in the "Voice of Truth" for that year, and classed me, virtually, with "drunkards;" for he said, they would not find fault with my position. Having thus publicly renounced me, and all sympathy with my views, why should I hesitate to say, as I did in the May Examiner, that I had "renounced *all* his *peculiarities* more than four years ago," &c. In the Examiner for July, 1845, I spoke as follows:—

"RELATION TO MR. MILLER."—For several years I have been satisfied that *individual* responsibility is the true doctrine of the Bible, as "every one of us shall give account of HIMSELF to God," Rom. xiv. 12; and, hence, that no man, or body of men, could take from us, with, or *without* our consent, innocently, our obligation to *speak* and *act* according to our conviction of what is the teaching of God's word, so long as we maintain an unimpeachable moral life.

"Mr. Miller, in a letter published in the Voice of Truth, some weeks since, said that if my present position is true, in regard to definite time for the advent, and some other matters, we had all been wrong—ought to make our confessions—and there was not a drunkard in the land that would find fault with such a position: and on my principles it was impossible to show that the advent was nigh.

"Here then is, *in fact,* an *exclusion* of myself from association with himself, and those that hold with him, so far as *his individual* action is concerned. As I have not, with my present light, any confession to make for my position on the time of the advent—and as Mr. Miller has in no way himself signified any disposition to reverse his judgment in that matter, I think it a duty I owe to my readers to let them know in what light he views me, that he may have no reproach on account of one that he does not admit has any connection with him and

the *peculiarities* of his theory. Towards *himself* I am not conscious that I have any other than the feelings which the gospel requires. I love and honor him for his *sincerity*, and his abundant labors in spreading abroad what he honestly believed was the truth; yet I believe he was in error, and those also who aided him in promulgating his peculiar views, specially on the subject of *time* for the advent. Nor do I think the only error was one of '*chronology*.'"

I trust, brethren, the foregoing remarks will set the subject in a true light before your minds, as to my meaning and design in the article which has been the occasion of this communication.

Yours truly, in hope of Immortality, Incorruptibility, Eternal Life, at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ our Lord. GEO. STORRS.

"CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, or, *Psalms and Hymns for the Use of all Christians*."—This work, compiled by the Editors of the Examiner, is offered to those for whom it is designed, not with the expectation that it will be found faultless, but in the full belief that it is the best small Hymn Book that has appeared. It is not designed to take the place of the many that have been used under the names of Camp Meeting, Revival, and Advent Hymns. With such books the christian community have been fully supplied, and can still use them as their taste or inclination leads them. We have aimed to cull from all sources, with alterations, Psalms and Hymns free from sectarianism. It has 128 pages, is put up in neat paper covers at 15 cents per copy; or, bound in plain morocco at 25 cents. If desired, plain gilt will be added; then the price will be 37½ cents. From these prices one-third discount will be made where a dollar is sent us for them free of expense. None but the paper covered ones can be sent by mail. We advise all to send for bound ones if they can get them by express or otherwise. It is more for our advantage to sell them in paper covers, but better for the purchaser to have them bound.

ARROGANCY OF SECTARIANISM.

One of the characteristics of the Man of Sin is, that he shall "sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." When bodies of professing christians assume the arrogant position of those described in the following communication from Dr. Lee, of N. C., they are justly entitled to a portion of the chair of "*His Holiness*." If any man "will live godly in Christ Jesus, he shall suffer persecution." The popular professors of religion, of this age, and their popular churches, lack the above mark of "living godly." They have settled down in pagan fables, and a pagan christianity is palatable and popular. But we leave them to their Judge.

MY DEAR BROTHER STORRS,—Will you please to read attentively and critically, the following Letter of the Meadow Branch Baptist Church, which appeared in the Biblical Recorder, of March 31st, 1849.

THE MEADOW BRANCH BAPTIST CHURCH—"*To all whom it may concern.*"

"Dr. I. F. Lee, an Elder of our Church, obtained a letter of dismission from this church, about two years ago; this letter, we are led to think, still remains in his possession. Since the action of the church in granting said letter, he has expressed doctrinal sentiments, which we consider entirely inconsistent with his covenant relations to our body, and subversive of the christian system. These sentiments he is openly promulgating, so as to promote confusion and discord. Two unsuccessful attempts have been made to bring him before the church, to answer for his conduct, in consequence of his heretical sentiments, and on account of refusal to answer to the church, he was unanimously excluded on Saturday before the 2d Sabbath in February last. We hope no church will receive the letter in his possession, bearing the signature of our church, as it is retained contrary to the will of the church.

Signed by order of the Church, and in behalf of the same. E. C. WILLIAMS, Mod.
J. W. BENTON, Clerk."

Union County, N. C., March 24, 1849.

To express such sentiments as the Bible contains, i. e. all the wicked will God destroy—punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of God, and the glory of his power—they shall utterly perish, &c.—and to promulgate them, with the sole view of extending the spread of correct scriptural doctrine, constitute, in the wisdom of the church, delinquency, confusion, discord, and lead to the subversion of the christian system. It may not be irrelevant to inform you, that this "Bull" was intended for me, for no other reason than, that I have circulated your Six Sermons, and endorsed the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked. I informed the said church that I had withdrawn from it, disposed of the letter in question, &c., and yet the church hopes that no church will receive it! It is truly strange how ambiguously some can speak. It is with great reluctance that I am led to conclude that that letter is false in fact—false in spirit. The doctrine to which it alludes, is not heretical or subversive of the Bible, which gives us the only christian system worthy our belief. Will the Church or the Association publish a refutation of the doctrine contained in your Six Sermons? Or, feeling their inability, or incapacity, will they employ T. Meredith, Editor of the Biblical Recorder, Raleigh, N. C.? I would like to see two attempts made to do it. I am apprehensive the church could conscientiously call them "*unsuccessful attempts*." The church asserts the doctrine is heretical and subversive of the christian system. I deny the assertion, and demand the proof. Doth our law condemn a man before it hear him? Does the church condemn a doctrine before it knows what that doctrine is, and what are the scripture evidences of its being of divine origin? I am satisfied that there was not one man out of twenty in the Association, that knew what was intended by the *Resolution* passed at its last meeting, relative to the Meadow Branch Church, and the Beulah Church—and I am safe, perfectly justified, in say-

ing, that the action of both is discreditable to any organised body professing the christian religion. At present I shall not notice this letter. But I earnestly request you to consider it, as though it had been intended directly to charge you with entertaining heretical sentiments, and promulgating them. Does it not, as some say, make you feel awful? How very learned some become, not by studying the scriptures and believing them, but by inspiration! Yes, one of the members of this learned body, declared to me, that he will never appear at the judgment seat of Christ—that he has been to judgment already—is now in the kingdom of heaven, and the kingdom of heaven in him—and that he will enter the kingdom of heaven at death—and that the church here on Earth, is the kingdom of heaven,—and that if ever he enjoyed the presence of God, it was after taking his *dram*—for he dram-drams it! Now this belief he got, he says, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost!! Is it not heart-rending, sir, to be excluded from a church where one of this class presides as deacon. He does not deny but he takes his glass of whiskey, and feels immediately after it the influence of the spirit. Now it so happens, that I was not a member of this church for months previous to the last Association—and of consequence, the church had no more jurisdiction over me, than it had over H. H. Dobney. Anticipating that the church would be guilty of some foolish thing or other, I procured, upwards of two years ago, a letter of dismission; and on the 21st June, 1847, wrote to a brother in one of the Northern States, inquiring if I might become a member of the church of which he was a member, and still reside here? His answer was yes. Shortly after the receipt of his letter, I forwarded the letter of dismission in question. Now all this I can prove—all this I informed the Meadow Branch Baptist Church, through J. V. Griffin and James Benton, who acted for the church, and who, instead of citing me to trial, requested me to call and preach for them, assuring me that they esteemed me as a beloved brother, and would always be happy to see me and hear me preach. How then can the church say, she has made two attempts to bring me to trial—and that she hopes no church will receive the letter of dismission now in my possession! I am compelled to believe she knows that this is false—or in other words, she has published what some of her members do not credit, and which none of them have any just ground to believe.

There is one thing now certain—that had I said letter in my possession, instead of presenting it to any church with which I wished to unite, I would take the letter in the Recorder, of May 31st, in preference, knowing that it would be a better and a safer way to recommend me to those who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake.

I am, my dear brother, in hope of eternal life, at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ, yours sincerely, I. F. Lee.

We assure Dr. Lee we "*feel awful*" only for the blindness and folly that could dictate such a course as is pursued by his opposers. "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."—Editor.

"The Eclectic Phrenological Advocate" will not be published at present.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

Ephesians Chap. IV.

Verse 17. This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind.

"In the Lord"—by his authority—"that ye walk not as [those] other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their minds:" or, in their vain imaginations. These vain imaginings the apostle describes, Rom. 1: 21. "When they knew God they glorified him not as God * * * but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man," &c. Their vain imaginings were, in placing the *uncorruptible* God on a level with *corruptible* man. The form of these "vain imaginations" is changed in this age of the world, and now attempts to make out the equally vain imagination, and approaching nearer to blasphemy, *viz.* That "corruptible man" is immortal; *i. e.* made like to the uncorruptible God. To walk in such doctrine is to walk in the vanity of our minds; or, in vain imaginations.

Verse 18. Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart.

This vanity of mind, spoken of in the previous verse, tends directly to darken the understanding, so as to make man ignorant of his own true character, standing, and wants: hence it is no wonder that he is alienated [*separated*] from the *life of God;* for that life is a spiritual life—or life produced in man by the Spirit of God, through Jesus Christ, by *re*generation, and not by Adamic generation; which produces nothing but a *corruptible* man: but, vain man judging himself *immortal*—or, as having the principle of endless life in himself—his "*ignorance*" of his utter and total corruptibility keeps him from understandingly seeking "the life of God;" and this—"because of the blindness of their heart," as to the absolute necessity of having this life communicated by the second Adam—Jesus Christ—who has the "quickening spirit," and by whom alone this spiritual life—or life of God—can be obtained.

Verse 19. Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.

"Who being past feeling"—become *insensible,* through the blindness, or hardness, of their heart, and the ignorance in them, to their own true state and the necessity of the "life of God"—or, having *hardened* themselves by their own imaginations, they "have given themselves over to lasciviousness"—their animal, or Adamic nature—"to work all uncleanness"—such gratifications as such a nature is alone capable of—"with greediness"—with *inordinate desire:* all habits gaining strength by indulgence or practice. As they had practiced according to the flesh—the first Adam, or animal nature—as they had resisted and quenched the Spirit—the bestowment of spiritual life by the second Adam—they were given up to their own choice. See Rom. 1: 24 to the end.

Verses 20 and 21. But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him as the truth is in Jesus.

Christians have not learned of Christ to "live

after the flesh"—the animal nature, or first Adam. If they are so living, it is conclusive evidence they have not given attention to the voice of Christ and "been taught by him;" for, "the truth is in Jesus" —the true doctrine of divine life—or life of God—was both taught by him and exemplified in his life, conversation, and tempers of mind: and that truth teaches us—

VERSES 22—24. That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

"Put off, concerning the former conversation"—or course of life—"the old man"—Adam, or animal nature—renouncing its *dominion*—put off its *government*, so as not to be subjected to its rule—"which" government or rule, "is corrupt"—or, tends only to corruption and death—"according to [the natural course of] the deceitful lusts"—or desires of the animal nature. Those desires promise happiness, but deceive those who remain under their government. "And be renewed"—become a *new person*—"in the spirit"—temper, disposition, affections, feelings, inclination—"of your mind: and that ye put on"—come under the government of—"the new man"—the second Adam, or that spiritual nature which is "the life of God" through Christ, and—"which after"—according to [denoting the source, or author,]—"God, is created in righteousness and true holiness:"—not merely a ceremonial or professional holiness, but *real* holiness, or Godlikeness—the life of God in you, really existing and ruling there.

VERSE 25. Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor: for we are members one of another.

"Wherefore"—on this account, *viz.* having put on the new man—"put away lying"—all "deceitful" conduct and conversation—"speak every man truth"—the opposite of lying—"with his neighbor" —fellow being—"for we are members one of another"—therefore, whoever injures his fellow-being by lying, injures *himself*. How little do men —even professed christian men—think of this. Are any of us trying to injure or destroy our fellow beings by deceitful conduct or conversation—let us remember we are thereby destroying ourselves. Thus has God ordained that sin shall bring its own punishment, and, Haman like, shall the perpetrator, sooner or later, perish on his own gallows.

VERSES 26 and 27. Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath; neither give place to the devil.

"Be ye angry and sin not." The true meaning of the original, we think, is the reverse of that which appears in the first part of this verse. The apostle had prohibited lying: he now adds—"*And* by no means"—on no account—"sin by anger"—if it arise "let not the sun go down upon your wrath"—upon your irritated state of mind—but put it away at once—for anger engenders *hatred*, and he that "hateth his brother is a murderer:" 1 John 3, 15: indulging in this spirit—which is giving "place to the devil"—he, like Cain, may commit *the act*—therefore "put away anger;" see verse 31; let it have *no place* in you. To talk about becoming angry and not sinning is a palpable contradiction, and one cannot help thinking the translators of this text were subject to anger, and wished to have a cloak for that sin; but no such cloak can be afforded by it, as is plain from the 31st verse.

VERSE 28. Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.

This verse enforces the duty of honest industry; and that not merely for selfish ends; but, that we may have to help those less favored than ourselves, or who may be in need. Christianity regards all men as one brotherhood, and especially they who are of the household of faith; and hence all are to be objects of our concern. An *idle* christian, who *will not* work, is *no* christian at all—he is unlike Christ. Such an one is, necessarily, a thief—*he lives by stealing*. "Let him steal no more—but labor, working with his hands;" then shall he know that "it is more blessed to give than to receive."

VERSE 29. Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.

"Let no corrupt"—depraved, vicious, foul, impure—"communication"—discourse, speech, language—"proceed out of your mouth;" and that because it is corrupting to others, and defiles him who utters it; see Matt. 15: 18—29: "but that which is good"—kind, profitable, fertilizing, pure, virtuous,—"to the use of edifying"—improvement in the divine life; conducing to spiritual advantage —"that it may minister grace"—holy dispositions; or beautify with holy qualities—"unto the hearers."

VERSE 30. And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.

"And grieve *by no means* [so the Greek preposition rendered "*not*" signifies,] the holy Spirit of God, whereby"—by which Spirit—"ye are sealed"—heaven's *impression—mark* or *witness* [see chap. 1: 13.]—"*unto*" or, *for* "the day of redemption"—or, the day when the deliverance from corruption shall take place; and those sealed *for it* shall receive "the adoption of children to God by Jesus Christ:" chap. 1: 5. Without this seal—or impress—on us, we cannot attain to that high "calling of God;" then, how appropriate the apostolic injunction—"by no means" to "grieve the holy Spirit of God;" we must have its impress, or image, or we are not of the family; if we grieve it, we shall fail to attain or retain that image.

VERSE 31. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice.

"Let all bitterness"—that which imbitters—harshness—"and wrath"—violent passion—"and anger"—indignation—"and clamour"—outcries, vociferations—"and evil speaking"—[Greek, "*blasphemia*"] railing, reviling, calumniating—"be put away from among you." Who in view of this verse will say, like Jonah, "I do well to be angry." The conduct and dispositions here enjoined to be put away, assuredly "grieve the holy Spirit of God," and therefore directly militate against our ever attaining to the "adoption of children."

VERSE 32. And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.

"And be ye kind"—loving—"one to another,

tender-hearted"—compassionate—"forgiving one another"—freely—"even as God for [Greek, *en*, by or through] Christ [the Anointed] hath forgiven you." We find no word in the original to correspond to that of "*sake*" in our translation: God forgives us, when we repent and do works meet, or suitable for repentance, *by*, or *through* Christ, and he does it freely—of his own free will—not because He has been *paid* by the Anointed; for, in that case, it would be no forgiveness at all. To represent God as either unable or indisposed to forgive our sins unless his Son pays him the debt, or suffers the penalty due for our sins, is to represent the sin-forgiving God in the same light as a hard-hearted creditor, who will have his pay, at all hazards, from somebody. Who can be made to believe that such a creditor ever exercises the grace of forgiveness at all? God freely forgives our sins when we exercise that disposition of mind which he requires; and this is shown when we truly repent of our wrong doing and are willing to receive the forgiveness *by* or *through* Christ, which is God's appointed way, or medium; and our submission to it manifests our submission to God. As God thus freely forgives us, so we are freely to forgive one another; and thus further manifest the truth and reality of our being His children by faith in Jesus Christ.

CHAP. v., VERSES 1, 2. Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God as a sweet smelling savour.

These verses should be considered in connection with the previous chapter, without interruption. The first is an exhortation founded upon the "kind, forgiving" character of God. He had said—God is kind, tender-hearted, and forgiving to you; "therefore," he adds, "be ye followers"—[Greek, *mimetai*] *imitators* "of God;" be like God—kind, tender-hearted, forgiving one another after the example of God in forgiving you—freely, truly. Be, then, imitators of God, as dear [Gr., *agapeta*] "*beloved* children." Beloved of God, who hath freely forgiven you, *in* Christ. How will such seek to *imitate* Him of whose love they have so freely been made the partakers? How else could they show themselves really "partakers of the divine nature," and truly beloved children? Will not children be like their parent? Are they not likely to imitate him just in the proportion that they love and admire him? Nothing can be clearer. If professed Christians manifest unkind feelings, hard-heartedness, and an unforgiving spirit, they are not "beloved children" of God—even if they pray and shout ever so much; yea, though they might preach, "cast out devils," and do ever so many "wonderful works," they lack the essential characteristic of God.

Next, the apostle exhorts to "walk in love;" not only occasionally to have those God-like dispositions, he had spoken of, but to "walk"—to make it the continual course of one's life—"in love." Paul had taught them that God's purpose concerning those whom he will *adopt* as children, is that they shall be "without blame before him *in love*;" he had spoken of the "great love wherewith God loved us, even when we were dead in sins," and of "the unsearchable riches of Christ;" also, of his own desire that they might be "rooted and grounded in love"—that is, planted and grow in it, as the soil suited to make them flourish; and now he adds, "*Walk in love:*" love is the foundation—love is the root—love is the soil—love is the end—and in order to that end, we must walk in love—the course, road or way by which we can be brought to the haven—"the adoption of children," or immortality, incorruptibility and endless life. The pattern of love after, or according to which we are to walk is "As Christ also [as well as God,] hath loved us." How did he love us? So that he "hath given himself for us"—in our behalf, or on our account—"an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." Though he knew no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth, yet, for his "brethren," who had sinned, he offered himself to sorrow, suffering and death, that he might deliver them, by overcoming their enemies, and by bringing them from a state of enmity to a state of reconciliation to God and to each other, making peace; therefore, walk in love after his example. If this direction was followed, how soon would it once more be said—"See how these Christians love one another." How can any be prepared for the "adoption," who are not thus walking? How else can they "be without blame before God in love?" Solemn thought! Let us lay it to heart. "*God is love*; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." 1 John, iv. 16.

ENCOURAGING.

From the Advent Harbinger.

DEAR BRO. MARSH: Our meeting, previously appointed at this place, closed last evening; and this morning, the friends dispersed, anticipating a meeting soon in the kingdom of God. We had a season of sweet interest, from our coming together on Thursday evening, till our separation on Monday morning. From 35 to 40 of the saints from abroad were present, in the unity of the spirit. Our social meetings were seasons of lively interest, and of profit; and the ministration of the word by Bros. Hoyt, Greenleaf, Chaplain, and Catlin, was to the instruction and edification of the children of God, and, in some cases, to the conviction of the unbelieving. The influence of the meeting, so far as we are able to judge, is decidedly good. We praise the Lord that we have enjoyed so good a season. It is to be hoped that each brother and sister, as they repair to their homes, to their respective callings, will be careful to keep the spirit of Christ. We come together in such assemblies, are stirred up by intercourse with each other, our hopes are enlivened by a renewed contemplation of the sacred promises of a glorious future, and the evidences of speedy deliverance, our zeal for the cause of God is much quickened, and we are filled with rejoicing. This is all well, proper, and profitable; but is all a very easy matter, and of very little consequence, compared with an every day Christian life. To live Christians at home, in our own families, in our own avocations and associations, is *the* difficult point of attainment. The person who can live a Christian at *home*, will find little difficulty elsewhere.

About eighteen months ago a copy of Storrs' Six Sermons was sent into this neighborhood; by it an interest in the truth was awakened, which prepared the way for the preaching of the word, which in the providence of God soon followed. There is now in the vicinity a congregation of sixteen, settled in the faith, and consistent in their

lives, besides five who have moved away, and two who have died, only four of whom had previously believed in the Advent, and kindred doctrines. The truth is still gaining ground, and I trust that yet more will, through its influence, be led to obey the Gospel, and thus become heirs according to promise. In many other places in the fields occupied by Bro. Catlin and Bro. Chaplin, there is a steady interest in the truth, and from time to time, some are coming out embracing the gospel faith, confessing and obeying it. And to an individual they receive the doctrine of life and immortality *through Christ*. We would invite any who may doubt whether the preaching of the destruction of the wicked is productive of any good, to come this way; visit the different congregations in this region, and get from the lips of the brothers and sisters themselves their histories. I think their doubts would be dissipated. There is great encouragement for persevering effort in proclaiming the whole truth. Brethren, let every one who labors for the salvation of men, remember that "the *gospel* is the *power* of God unto *salvation*, to every one that believeth;" and remembering this, be sure that you understand what the *gospel* is, that proclaiming it, you may induce men to believe and obey it, that thereby they may be saved.

Your Bro. in hope of Eternal life,

E. MILLER, Jr.

Middlebury, Elkhart Co., Ind., May 29, 1849.

LETTERS.

BR. H. J. SWEETLAND, Square Pond, Conn., June, 1849, writes:

BR. STORRS—Brethren here are strong in the faith of the doctrine you advocate; *viz:* No Immortality out of Christ, and Eternal Life only though Christ, at his coming to raise the sleeping saints. This, I rejoice to say, is the faith of nine-tenths of the Advent believers. I know of some who advocate this doctrine, who have never been with us in the Advent faith. This truth is still working among the people, and some have come out firm in the faith of the "Sleep of the Dead," and "Destruction of the Wicked," within one year, who have been strongly opposed. One brother in particular, a preacher, with whom I have had many a discussion. But I am happy to think, that when I see him again, we shall not have to take opposite ground, but shall agree in the faith. I have been very much interested in the discussion between Brethren Walsh and Brewster, and it has given me much light. The Bible is a book containing deep subjects, and glorious promises to the lover of truth. I wish Bro. Walsh would write more; yea, I wish the Examiner could be issued weekly. Bro. Brewster writes like an honest man, and it appears that he must see the truth on this subject. I see he has not answered Bro. Walsh's questions in the Examiner for February; he has not touched them. I hope he will come out like Bro. M. Bates. I am still trying to contend for the truth, and rejoice to see that it is steadily gaining ground.

—

BR. PARKER SAWYER, Hampton, N. Y., writes:

DEAR BROTHER—Please send me the "Bible Examiner," commencing with your Discussion with L. Lee, upon the *Immortality* of the *Soul*.

Notwithstanding the cry of Infidelity against you, I hope you will not be discouraged in your efforts to defend the heaven-born truths of the Bible. I fully believe that your labors, and that of others, to show to the world that the "wages of sin is *death*"—(*Not Eternal Life in misery,*)—and that in the triumph of our Saviour over death and 'hades' (hell,) rests all our hopes of an Immortal existence, will yet be abundantly successful.

Your view of the nature of the soul, takes from the *Infidel* every vestige of hope of a future existence, without an interest in Christ; whilst the popular doctrine of the day, gives him a fortified position, from which he may hurl his envenomed shafts of reproach and contempt, against the doctrine of a resurrection through Jesus Christ, and utterly contemn it as absurd and *unnecessary*.

There is great commotion in the public mind, which I regard as tokening a day when the *Christian Church* shall be restored to her primitive pristine purity in faith and works.

—

BR ALVA N. SEYMORE, Michigan, writes:

BR. STORRS—If I was able, I would send for a hundred copies of your Six Sermons, because they are in great demand where they are known. There is an anxiety in many minds to hear and read on the subject. Mrs. Seymore and myself spend our whole time in traveling, and we are proclaiming the speedy coming of the Lord—Life and Death—no immortality only through Christ, &c. The Lord has blessed us in so doing, and souls are rejoicing in the truth. To God belongs all the glory. Two preachers have been led to see the truth in regard to life and death, by our labors, and three young men are preparing themselves to proclaim these truths.

Cannot our friends in Michigan open a Depository somewhere in that State? See our offer on last page of the Examiner.—EDITOR.

—

BR. WM. G. PROCTOR, Rays' Hill, Pa., June 18th, writes:

BR. STORRS—I have just returned from a two days' meeting, at which there was good attention, and at which I presented the true doctrine of Life and Immortality. I have had to struggle long and hard; but notwithstanding adverse circumstances and an abundance of opposition, the cause is still onward. There is one thing in which I have the advantage, that is, I challenge to open combat, and invite opponents to call and converse with me, at my dwelling. I publish it to large audiences, that I will take pleasure in answering the interrogatories of sincere inquirers. But what a hanging back, and the people see it. I spoke yesterday of the necessity of a Hymn Book, free of the erroneous sentiments of the times, and promised to send for yours if I was encouraged to do so; and forthwith I received a list of thirty-three. Send me fifty bound ones.

—

PROVIDENCE, R. I., June, 1849.

ENCOURAGEMENT.—BR. STORRS—I am sorry to learn that the *Examiner* is no better sustained.—The paper is evidently bringing to light hidden treasures, from God's great store-house, which are of vast importance. And we cannot well do without it. But what shall be done? If some effectual plan can be devised, I stand pledged to perform in any way consistent with my ability. I am willing to double the amount which I have already paid, if required. Will that do? Who will do likewise? I say, let us all come up to the work, and take hold

manfully and understandingly, and relieve the paper from embarrassment at once, and keep it free for the discussion of subjects of most vital importance. RANSOM HICKS.

Br. Hicks has taken 17 papers since January, and now says he will *double* what he has paid. If onehalf our subscribers are as prompt in affording us relief, we shall soon be relieved from all embarrassment for the present year. All such will receive our thanks, besides removing a heavy burden from our mind. May the Lord abundantly bless them.—EDITOR.

BR. JACOB HAWES, Middlefield, Mass., in writing for Dobney on Future Punishment, and some of the Six Sermons, says:

I am the only one in this town who publicly avows the doctrine of the "sleep of the dead"—the "destruction of the wicked"—and "Endless Life only in Christ." Being a member of the Baptist Church, I avail myself of every opportunity to bring the subject before the minds of my brethren and sisters; and many of them, in private conversation, will admit that they cannot refute the doctrine by scripture argument. Yet they have not the moral courage to publicly and fearlessly avow it. I have also invited the Pastor of the Baptist Church, or any one who chose, to a fair and candid discussion, but no one accepts.

If they will not discuss, I trust they will read. I therefore order the above named documents, which I shall scatter amongst them as soon as received, hoping they may prove to be "good seed sown on good ground," and bring forth fruit to the praise of "Him who hath redeemed us from death and made us heirs of the Grace of Life."

THE QUESTION ANSWERED.—An exchange paper in opposing the unconscious state of the dead asks:

"Why do you, and others, in quoting this text, always stop at the comma,—'the dead know not anything?' The text reads, 'the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward.' Those who quote this to disprove consciousness, either know what follows, or they do not: why do they omit it? Did one of them ever quote beyond the comma (,)?"

We answer YES. And we will tell you when and where; *viz.*, in the Bible Examiner, March, 1844. But our exchange says:

"If it signifies that the spirit is unconscious of anything, it must also follow that the spirit will never more have a reward, which would deny the resurrection of the righteous, who will have a reward."

It is your own theory that *denies* the resurrection; for it is *the dead* that are to be raised; who, you affirm, are not dead but alive. But again, the text does not say they "WILL NEVER more have a reward." We replied to this same objection in "Bible Examiner, March, 1844." We now say that the whole verse—yes that part beyond the "*comma*"—confirms the truth that the dead are unconscious. It says not, "they *will never* more have a reward," but simply—"neither *have they*," &c. Br. Exchange, is that the *present tense*, [or, *present* state of the dead] or is it the *future tense*, as you make it? Our grammar, to say nothing of our "Hebrew," makes "*have*" the sign of the present: it seems yours converts it into the sign of the future: i. e., it makes *have* mean "*will* never have." Now the whole verse in question, instead of weakening the argument against the unconscious state of the dead, *confirms it.* It shows conclusively that the dead are not conscious, else they would *have* a reward, in the present tense. But the wise man says—"*The dead know not anything;*" therefore it follows that, "they *have* no more a reward." Not that they "*will never have;*" for when the last trump sounds the time will have arrived that God will "give reward unto his servants the prophets," &c. See Rev. 11: 15—18. From their death till that time they "*have* no reward:" but then, they will be rewarded.

WE are greatly obliged to Eld. Jasper Hazen, of the Christian Palladium, for sending us a copy of his new Hymn Book.

"THE ADVENT HARBINGER" is a weekly paper published at Rochester, New York, by Eld. Joseph Marsh. It is the best paper of the class published. It has just commenced a new volume, greatly enlarged. Terms $2 per year, or $1 for six months. Though we do not agree with all it contains, we will receive subscriptions for it if any desire.

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in

BOSTON, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 37 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store.

LOWELL, Mass., of Eld. M. Bates, Chapel St., one door above Elm.

ALBANY, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, No. 344 Broadway.

NEW YORK CITY, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., of Ransom Hicks, No. 215 Pine St.

HARTFORD, Conn., of Dr. D. Crary.

All orders sent us, at Philadelphia, Pa., for Dobney, to be forwarded by *Express*, will be sent to New York City, without expense, going north, east or west.

Our "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh, Eld. Bates, Geo. T. Adams, Dr. Burdell, and Ransom Hicks.

PRICE OF BOOKS, ETC., AT THE EXAMINER OFFICE.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, (New Hymn Book,) 128 pages, 24mo., paper covers, 15 cts. each; ten copies for $1.00; for $8.00, one hundred copies.

SIX SERMONS, Quarto, 16 pages, (newspaper postage, only, when sent by mail,) $1.00 per forty copies. No further discount can be made on either of the above works.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, bound, *seventy five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifty*.

SIX SERMONS, 18mo., 120 pages, bound, *twenty-five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifteen*.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, bound in plain morocco, *twenty-five* cts.

On the three last named works *one-third* discount will be made to those who buy to sell again: and we will make a still further discount of *twenty per cent.* to those who send us twenty dollars, current money, at one time. This offer is designed to enable those who may wish it, to keep a depository of these works, and to cover their expense for transportation. The names of such we will place in the list of depositories, in the Examiner.

☞We cannot make the "twenty per cent" discount unless our terms are strictly complied with; as we are subjected to an additional charge to our printer if we have credit for his work; and a less sum than $20 would not help us much in obtaining discount with him.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD.

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1849. No. 8.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW—No. V.

Mr. Lee says—"Its (the spirit's) improvement, is a distinct matter from the improvement of the body."

What does he mean by the "improvement of the body?" Does he mean the *growth* of the "body?" What does he mean by the "body?" Does he mean the whole physical organization, or a part of it? If he uses the term as indicative of the whole organism, then it is equivalent to the *man;* which would be to make "the improvement of the spirit a distinct matter from the improvement of the man." Understanding Mr. Lee, therefore, to mean the physical constitution, the question recurs—does he mean by "the improvement of the body" its growth in bulk or size? If so, I would remark, that *stubborn facts* establish the *law*, that other conditions being equal, the development of mind is in the *ratio* of the development of the physical organization. What are these "*other conditions?*" The answer to this question is found in the fact, that there are several *systems of organs*, giving rise to different functions, and modifying the manifestations of mind. The *ample* development of the *glandular system* does not increase the mental power, but modifies it. The excessive development of the *muscular system* does not import mental activity; but it gives *durability* to body and mind. The *sanguineous* and *nervous systems* impart physical and mental activity.

Again, a person may be born with an organization unfavorable to the development of much mind—they may be idiotic; but, in this case, the *nervous system* will be defective. Again, they may be diseased, and, from this cause, imbecile. Again, education may have been *partial* and defective; the muscular system may have been cultivated at the expense of the nervous; and then, "the body may grow and flourish in all the perfection of health, and the mind make little or no progress." Again, the *nervous system* may be developed at the expense of the *sanguineous*, and "the body," or man, "be of exceedingly frail structure, pale and wan;" but it is not true that "a giant mind may develop itself from within." The mind of such a person may possess great *vivacity, sprightliness* and *brilliancy*, but it will be wanting in *strength, depth, power* and *durability*. But, in all this, the law holds good, that, *as is the organization, so is the mind.*

Mr. Lee says—"Some of the greatest geniuses the world has ever produced, have had but just body enough to hold the soul." This is a mere fancy sketch, containing no argument. A man, however, may be a "*genius,*" with little or no *talent*. Again, Mr. L. says—"These facts certainly indicate that the soul and the body, are not one and the same thing!" Truly! who ever contended that they were "one and the same thing!" The one may be an attribute of the other, and both may be mortal—both matter—Mr. Lee's "facts" to the contrary notwithstanding!

2. Mr. Lee tells us, that "the body comes to maturity and begins to decline, at an age when the mind has but just commenced its career of improvement." This is a fallacy, for the "career of improvement" begins almost with our birth. "A sound mind in a sound body" is a sentiment, which embodies the truth upon this subject. The *nervous system* may be healthy, unimpaired and elastic, when the muscular and glandular have declined; and the mind may thus be proportionably active, when the physical strength is partially gone. But when there is a general decay of the whole organization, the mind goes down with the body. And whether a man shall be a *dotard* at "fifty, sixty, or seventy," depends upon the strength, soundness and durability of the *whole* constitution.

3. Mr. Lee alludes to the doctrines of phrenology, and informs us that nothing is gained by admitting their truth—that phrenologists "will not make this the issue, and base their science on the doctrine of materialism, to stand or fall with it." If by "*materialism*" Mr. Lee means *matter*, I affirm that phrenologists do base their science on "materialism;" for they *base* it on the anatomy and physiology of the *brain*—which is matter; while, at the same time, they may not follow up their *principles* to their *legitimate results*. I shall not reflect upon the *motives* of those phrenologists, who have labored to popularize, and harmonize phrenology with sectarian theology. *But, for one, fearless of all consequences,* I DO MAKE THE ISSUE, AND BASE THE PHRENOLOGICAL DOCTRINES UPON THE MATERIAL ORGANIZATION OF MAN, INDEPENDENT OF ALL "IMMATERIALITY," IMMORTALITY, OR INCORRUPTIBILITY; AND I CHALLENGE ALL PHRENOLOGISTS, NO MATTER WHO, NOR WHERE THEY ARE, WHETHER IN EUROPE OR AMERICA, TO DISPROVE THE CORRECTNESS OF THIS POSITION.

This is the only view that will, or can harmonize with the volume of Revelation; and every effort to harmonize the sublime science of mind, with the paganized traditions of modern sectarianism, degrades both it and them!

Yes, sir, a voice speaks from the highest heavens, and proclaims to all the sons of men, that they *are mortal*, having *not* one spark of immortality, but corruptible and perishing; and mental science—

the science of man—sends back the sound, *all is mortal!*

4. We shall now examine Mr. Lee's concluding philosophical argument, which is this: "The mind often developes itself in greater power and glory, just at the moment of death, shining out from an emaciated body, already wan and cold."

Here Mr. Lee rallies all his powers, concentrates all his forces, and pours along his logical troop! We shall pay particular attention to this argument, not on account of its strength, but on account of its *commonness.*

"The mind often develops itself in its *greatest power* and *glory*, just at the moment of death." This, as a proposition, is monstrous; as an argument, absurd; and as a fact, is not true. "The mind develope its GREATEST POWER *and* GLORY, *at the moment of death!*" Did ever the mind of a man, "at the moment of death," develop the powers of a Solomon?—a Bacon?—a Locke?—a Herschell?—a Franklin? Here are specimens of mind in its "greatest power." Did ever the mind of man, "at the moment of death," when the "emaciated body" was "already wan and cold," develope the "glory"—the eloquence of a Cicero, or a Demosthenes? The answer is, and must be, in the negative. But Mr. Lee says—"It is true that in some cases the mind appears to decay with the decaying body, but to prove that it is the body or any part of it, this would have to be always so without exception, which is not the case." Mr. Lee has the argument here by the blade, instead of the handle; and cuts himself rather than his opponent! The mind should *never* "appear to decay with the decaying body," if it be immortal! If it be neither "the body nor any part of it," there should be no "exception" to the "power" and "glory" of its development "at the moment of death," "which," as Mr. Lee says—"is not the case." And now I will explain to Mr. Lee why it is, that some minds are more brilliant in death than others.

1. It depends upon the *nature* of the disease, and its *seat*. There are some diseases which preternaturally excite the brain, and consequently, the mental powers. We witness this in various forms of *fever*. And sometimes this febrile condition becomes so exalted and intense, that the patient becomes eloquent, musical, furious and insensible by turns, according to the nature of the case. In this condition the patient's animal, moral, or intellectual faculties may be principally excited, and develope their functions accordingly. They may shout, pray, sing, or curse, swear and rage, just as their different faculties are the seat of the most intense cerebral action. Some, in this condition may "die shouting glory! glory!! glory!!!" and others die perfectly frantic and furious.

Again, in disease of the heart and lungs, the integrity of the mind is partially maintained till death closes the scene; but this is because the brain is not immediately involved in the disease, and therefore it manifests its functions, though with less power, to the last.

2. Another cause, already hinted at, is, the fact that *death* sometimes commences at the *heart*, and at the lungs. The first is called *death by anæmia*—the want of a due supply of blood to the heart. In this case the faculties may be retained to the last for the reason already given.

The same remarks apply to *death by apnæa*, privation of breath. The person, being cut off suddenly, retains his senses to the end; or, if not dying suddenly, he gradually wastes away by consumption of the pulmonary organs, and dies in possession of a degree of mental power.

Death by coma may either be sudden, or more or less protracted according to circumstances.

These are some of the reasons why some persons die in the possession of some mental power, and others perfectly insensible. These *phenomena* are perfectly plain upon the view we take of the constitution of man; but can Mr. Lee, or any one else, explain them upon his hypothesis? "The mind may kindle up at the moment of death, and blaze out with intellectual fire," but it is the mere flickering—the mere flashing up, of the waning intellect, which, like the dimly burning taper, gives signs of its extinguishment! "The body" may be "wan, cold and helpless," and the mind will shine as dimly, and burn as faintly as the expiring lamp! An occasional out-burst—an occasional flash, is not the strength, power and glory of a giant mind; but the sure indications of a speedy dissolution.

Mr. Lee speaks of "the mind, being roused by the prospect of heaven, or seized with the terror of impending perdition," as "flashing with the fires of immortality," and "shedding a living glare as it quits its house of clay and enters upon the destinies of the spirit world!"

The whole of this is a beautiful delusion! a sublime absurdity!! There is no truth—no argument—no logic in it. This going to "*heaven*" at death, or down to "perdition," are old wives' fables. They are pagan traditions, newly vamped by the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth.

No, gentle reader, man is mortal, death is the extinction of life and sense and mind; and nothing but the resurrection can restore these attributes to man. So we come back to our starting point—no organization, no life; no life, no mind.

And here we leave Mr. Lee, to the *mercy* of his own ill-fated philosophical arguments.

J. T. W.

REVIEW—No. VI.

Having examined Mr. Lee's philosophical argument, I now proceed to his scriptural.

1. His first argument is based upon Gen. 35: 18, "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died,) that she called his name Ben-oni."

The reader will please bear in mind that the subject before Mr. Lee's mind is the "immateriality of the soul," and that this text has been adduced to prove it! But if he can see any connection between *it* and the subject, he can see far better than I can. Her "soul departed," *ergo*, it is immortal! Truly, this is an "age of reason." Mr. Lee says, "Her body did not depart. Her brains did not depart!" And was there nothing else which could "depart," and which, in scripture language, is termed the "soul?" Could not her *breath*—her *life* depart, and "her body" and "brains" remain? This text proves only one thing, and that is the *departure* of the woman's soul, life, or breath; and has no bearing whatever upon Mr. Lee's question.

But Mr. Lee thinks his doctrine of "immateriality," is taken for granted in the Bible! This is begging the question. The Bible, so far as I know, takes nothing for granted: and, even if it did, this would not do away with the necessity of Mr. Lee's

proving his position, by *proving* that the Bible takes it for granted. Let him not assume this, but prove it.

2. His second proof is Numbers 16: 22, where God is spoken of as the "God of the spirits of all flesh." What has this to do with Mr. Lee's "immaterial soul?" I admit that God is "the God of the spirits of all flesh," because "in Him we *live*, move, and have our being;" but this does not prove that "the spirits of all flesh" are the "immaterial souls" of all flesh. Inasmuch as "the spirit of life," or "breath of life," which inflates the lungs, oxygenizes the blood, and gives life to the flesh, is from God; He is emphatically the "God of the *lives* of all flesh." And, I apprehend, this is the meaning of the passage. In Numbers 27: 15, 16, there is a passage of similar import.

3. Mr. Lee's third argument is Job 14: 22. "But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn." Were I disposed to be hypercritical, I might analyze this thus: First, we have the "flesh;" second, the "him;" and third, the "soul." The "flesh" is not the "him," because it is *upon* "him;" and the soul is not the "him," because it is *in* "him." It follows, therefore, according to this mode of reasoning, that neither the "flesh" nor the "soul" constitutes the "him," or man. How will this tally with Mr. Lee's theory? This shows the folly of all such reasoning. The simple meaning of the text is this: The "flesh upon" his person "shall have pain, and his heart within him shall mourn."

4. His fourth proof is Job 31: 30, "Neither have I suffered my mouth to sin, by wishing a curse to his soul." Here, again, I may ask the question, What has this to do with the "immortality of the soul?" The term soul is often used as a Hebraism for the person, and as often used for life; so that the text and context must determine its signification in any given case. In the text before us, it evidently means life, or the person of whom life was an attribute.

5. His fifth argument is chapter 32: 8, "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." This is the most plausible scriptural argument yet offered by Mr. Lee, but this does not prove his point. Mr. Lee himself admits that this "appears to be an allusion to God's breathing into man the breath of life, after he had formed him of the dust of the ground, by which he 'became a living soul.'" In addition to this admission on the part of Mr. Lee, it is remarkable that the spirit is represented as being without knowledge until the "inspiration of the Almighty gives *them* understanding." Mr. Lee makes another important admission, which I hope the reader will remember. It is this: "*Man* here denotes the visible, tangible frame, the *body*; in this there is a spirit." Very well; "man," then, is the "body," animated by "a spirit"—"the breath of life," and God gives them "understanding." Thus Mr. Lee has helped us to the refutation of his argument.

6. Mr. Lee's sixth proof is Proverbs 19: 2, "that the soul be without knowledge is not good." He thinks "this text clearly implies the existence of an intelligent soul, distinct from the body." But how can an "immortal soul," which is self-conscious—self-intelligent, "be without knowledge?" Here Mr. Lee is caught in his own snare! I regard this text, therefore, notwithstanding what Mr. Lee says about the definite article, as being similar, in this respect, to the passage, "the *soul* that sins, it shall die;" and as referring to man, in relation to that attribute of his nature which is the seat, or *sensorium* of the mind.

7. His seventh argument is based on Eccles. 12: 7, "Then shall the dust return unto the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." This clearly refers to God's "creating man of the dust, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life;" and has no more to do with the "immateriality of the soul," than the *blood* of man. When man dies, that which came from the earth, returns to the earth; and that "breath of life" which God "breathed into his nostrils" returns to him in the expanse of Heaven. In point of *fact*, however, the *body* is not less from God than the spirit, or "breath of life." Both are from Him. And this same author, Solomon, as well as Moses, speaks of the beasts as possessing the same "spirit of life." "They all have one breath; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

8. Mr. Lee's eighth proof is Ezek. 18: 4, "Behold, all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine." Why did not Mr. Lee quote the whole verse? Why did he omit the last clause? Was it because the whole verse would not answer his purpose? "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die*," was too strong for Mr. Lee! He reminds me of a person, who is running along a beautiful lawn, where everything is pleasant to the eye, and grateful to the senses; but suddenly an awful precipice presents itself, and the man starts back with horror at the impending danger! So Mr. Lee, conscious of the truth of his position, passes rapidly from text to text, hoping to fortify his favorite doctrine of "immateriality," when suddenly and unexpectedly he treads upon the very brink of a logical abyss, where all his arguments are in danger of being precipitated to the gulf below. He pauses, starts back, and retreats!! with the words sounding in his ears, and vibrating along the fibres of his brain,—"THE SOUL THAT SINNETH, IT SHALL DIE!" This text, so far from helping Mr. Lee, is fatal to his whole theory; for it affirms that the sinful soul shall die, which is incompatible with his view of the subject.

9. His next argument is founded on Zech. 12: 1, where God speaks of forming "the spirit of man within him." There is no difficulty here, according to our view, whether we understand the term "spirit" to apply to the *life* or the *mind*. Both life and mind are "formed," developed, or manifested "*within*" the man. But Mr. Lee takes a liberty which the rules of logic do not allow him. He proves that man has a soul or spirit, but its *nature* he takes for granted. He is not required to prove that man has a "spirit," but to prove that spirit "*immortal*." This he has failed to do; for to do this it is not enough to prove that the spirit is a distinct entity from the body; but he must also show that it is necessarily immortal. This he can never do.

10. His tenth argument is based on Rom. 8: 16, where Paul speaks of the witness of the Holy Spirit "with our spirit." On this I remark that neither God nor man "bears witness," except by words or signs addressed to the minds of men. "The spirit bears witness with our spirits," minds, or hearts, if you please, that we are the children of God: but this "witness" is in his word, and addressed to our understandings; and not to our feelings or pas-

sions. The christian has better evidence of his being a "child of God," than a mere impulse, or feeling, which is the sport of a thousand circumstances. When his heart, his life, his words, &c. are all in harmony with the Gospel, then it is that "the spirit," by that word, "bears witness" with his mind, his conscience, that he is born of God.

11. His next proof is 1 Cor. 2: 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?" This belongs to a class of texts already examined, and means no more, I apprehend, than that a man is alone conscious of the operations of his own mind.

12. Mr. Lee refers to chap. 6: 20 as a proof—"For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and your spirit, which are God's." This proves that men can glorify God "in the body," although "matter," which, I suppose, is more than Mr. Lee would willingly admit. The text clearly teaches us the *whole man*, "soul, body and spirit," should be devoted to His cause. That all the physical, moral and mental powers should be consecrated to his service. I see nothing in this to favor the popular theory.

13. He then refers us to 2 Cor. 4: 16, where Paul speaks of an "outward" and "inward man." I am willing that Peter shall explain Paul. See 1 Peter 3: 3, where he defines the "inward" or "hidden man" to be "the heart."

14. His fourteenth proof is 2 Cor. 7: 1, "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." Apart from the absurd idea that "*filthiness*" is here ascribed to an "immaterial spirit," it must be evident to those who think for themselves, that the apostle meant no more than that they should put away all evil—all immoral contaminations, and be holy in life, temper and disposition.

15. Mr. Lee's final argument in the article I am reviewing, is James 2: 26, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." In this passage, it is perfectly evident the term "spirit" signifies "breath," the breath of life; and it is so rendered in the margin. This text is *against* Mr. Lee, and proves that, after the *expiration* of the breath, there is not an "immortal spirit" animating the body; but that as "faith without works is dead," so "the body without breath is dead also."

In Mr. Lee's concluding article on the immateriality of the mind, he argues thus: "The same words which are applied to man to describe his spiritual nature, are applied to God," "and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the human soul is spirit, and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit."

Now, kind reader, that you may see the force of this argument, I will apply it to another matter, thus: "The same words which are applied to" *the wind*, "to describe" its "spiritual nature, are applied to God," "and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the" *wind* "is spirit and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit."

This is Mr. Lee's argument, only it is applied to the wind instead of man; and the reader can at once see its fallacy. I could give examples as Mr. Lee has done, but this is unnecessary. We might as well argue that because certain terms, generally applied to other objects, are used in relation to God, that their natures were similar, as to argue that because the term spirit is applied to man, therefore his spirit is like God's—immortal. The terms "sun," "soul," "heart," "wings," "shadow," &c. are used in relation to Jehovah; but who would thence infer that He is of the same nature with the "sun," or that His "soul" and "heart" are of the same nature with the "soul" and "heart" of man?

Does Mr. Lee really believe that God has a "soul" and a "heart?" If so, He is a *compound* being, and no compound is eternal. These words are used in reference to Him, in an accommodated or figurative sense; so also is the term spirit when applied to man—to the wind—to the breath of life—to the mind—and to the life itself.

"God is a spirit" in the highest sense of the word; but when this term is applied to the wind, and to man, it is used in a subordinate sense. As well might Mr. Lee argue that because the same word is applied to the *beasts*, therefore, they have "immortal spirits." Mr. Lee's argument, to be valid, must hold good in all cases to which the term is applied; or else, if there be an exception, I shall maintain that *man* is an exception.

Mr. Lee refers to the text, "the spirits of just men made perfect," which, I apprehend, applies to persons raised from the dead, and not to men in the flesh. He also quotes the text, "God is spirit; and they that worship him must worship him *with* spirit and *with* truth," to follow his reading. What is the meaning of the passage? It is this; that mere outward forms—the "drawing nigh unto God with the lips, while the heart is far from him"—is not acceptable worship. His worship must proceed from the heart—be pure, sincere, and according to the "truth;" for "in vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." But the text contains not the slightest proof that the spirit of man is immortal, which is the point to be proved. Mr. Lee has signally failed in this part of his argument; indeed, we may say of them all, that they contain the elements of their own refutation. He set out to prove the "immateriality of the soul," and the reader can judge how far he has succeeded. Sometimes he affirms "immateriality" of the "*soul*," and then of the "spirit:" he quotes a text to prove this of the "*soul*," and, *anon*, of the "spirit;" so we are, after all, at a loss to know whether he affirms "immateriality" of both, or of one. The popular theory presents a chaotic system—a confused mass—a perfect Babel, without order and without light. The advocates of it talk of "*spiritual* SUBSTANCES," and yet deny the existence of *spirit-matter*, as though there was any difference between "*substance*" and "*matter!*" But I have gotten through with Mr. Lee's arguments, and must await his next article. J. T. W.

THE DISCUSSION.—As Br. Lee, of the True Wesleyan, has expended his strength, in his article No. IX. on the immortality of the soul, particularly on a paragraph in our "Six Sermons," we have judged best to give the reader his entire article; and we should be pleased to see Br. Walsh's reply to it in the Wesleyan. We really wish we were publishing a weekly paper; for, in that case, we

would give all Br. Lee's articles entire, which would give us much pleasure; and we have been half tempted to give them as it is. We would reply to the following article ourself, but do not choose to interfere with our Associate Editor in his review.

THE CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL AFTER THE DEATH OF THE BODY.

An argument from the immateriality, or spiritual nature of the soul.

Our first argument in proof that the soul does not die with the body, but maintains a conscious existence after the body is dead, is drawn from its immateriality or spiritual nature. The foundation for this argument has been laid in the preceding numbers, in which the immateriality of the human soul has been proved. We are not called upon here to prove this point, but only to make an application of it as a truth already established.

Before we enter upon the direct argument, it is necessary to state the precise point to be proved by it. It has been misunderstood, and hence, met by a misdirected and insufficient reply. Rev. George Storrs, in his six sermons against the soul's immortality, meets the argument thus:

"It is said—*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.* One single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—'Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.'"

It should be remarked on this extract, that as a reply it is defective in two particulars:

1. It assumes that "destruction" means a loss of conscious existence, when applied to the soul. This is not admitted, but as it belongs to another division of our subject, we will not argue it here, *but leave it to be attended to in its proper place.*

Its capital defect is, it entirely misapprehends the question. The argument does not rest upon the assumption that God cannot destroy or annihilate a spirit after he has created it, but only that the soul is immortal in its nature, having no tendency in itself to annihilation, and must exist forever, unless sent into non-existence by the same Almighty Power which gave it being. There is an important distinction between the natural immortality of the soul, and God's power to annihilate it, which Mr. Storrs entirely overlooked in his attempt to meet the argument. God may be able to destroy what is immortal in its own nature, and what would live forever but for such destruction; hence, could it be proved that God can destroy the human soul; yea, could it be proved that he will annihilate it, it would not follow that it is not ever living in its own nature. If the soul is not immortal in its own nature, it must cease to exist by the operation of the laws of its being, just as the body does, and can need no destruction from the Almighty, any more than the body, to cause it to cease to exist. To argue that God can destroy the soul, as Mr. Storrs does, implies that it will not die of itself, without the direct exertion of Almighty Power to do it. The body is mortal, is a compound, an organism, and by the operation of the laws of its elemental and organic nature, must wear itself out and cease to exist, without being destroyed by the direct operation of external force, as is implied when Mr. Storrs affirms that God can destroy the soul. On the other hand, if the soul is a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible, it must be immortal in itself, and must exist forever, unless actually destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it existence.

This argument then, is not designed to prove that God cannot destroy the human soul, nor even that he will not, but only that the soul, being spirit and not matter, simple and not compound, indivisible and not dissoluble, it must be immortal in its nature, and live after the body is dissolved, yea, live forever, unless destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it being. To this point we will now direct a few thoughts.

1. The soul being an immaterial, uncompounded spiritual essence, as fully proved in the preceding, it cannot be affected by such agents as operate upon and destroy compound bodies and organisms. Frost will kill the body, but no one will contend that an immaterial spirit can be frozen to death. The body is divisible, and may be cut to pieces, but it will not be pretended that an immaterial, intangible, indivisible soul can be cut to pieces, with saws, knives and axes. It is admitted that the soul resides in the body during our natural life; now suppose a machine should be constructed, which at one blow would cut the body as fine as the sand upon the sea shore, would the soul be cut to pieces by the operation, admitting it to be in the body at the time? It certainly would not, unless that which is immaterial can fill space so as to obstruct matter—unless that which is indivisible can be divided.

Suppose you cast both soul and body together into a furnace as hot as the one prepared by Nebuchadnezzar, and what will be the result? The body will be consumed in a moment; but the soul will not be burned up. An immaterial, uncompounded spirit cannot be affected by material fire, any more than it can by frost; it could dwell alike in the sun or in the polar regions. The reader will now see the importance and force of our long argument on the immateriality of the mind. It is a vital point; if we have proved in the preceding numbers, that the human mind is an immaterial spirit, as we trust we have, the above reasoning shows that it must be immortal in its own nature, and that it will live forever unless it be destroyed by God its Maker. By all the conclusiveness, then, by which we have sustained the immateriality of the soul, does its immortality follow.

2. The argument drawn from the immateriality of the soul, not only proves that it is immortal in itself, living forever, if left to the operations of the laws of its own nature, but it proves that God cannot destroy it, in the manner in which destructionists generally suppose. Be particular; we do not say that God cannot annihilate a human soul, or any simple spirit which he has created, but only that he cannot do it in the manner in which destructionists generally contend he will do it. If God should annihilate the human soul, it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which he put forth when he created it, and which not only sustains every human soul, but the universe of both matter and mind. This mode of annihilation forms no part of the creed of destructionists; they argue their doctrine from the Scriptures, which threaten and describe the punishment of the wicked; and represent the loss of existence as a part of, and end of this punishment, and as the result of positive infliction and suffering; and hence, they rely upon the words, destroy, burned up, consumed, and other like expressions. The argument founded upon the spiritual nature of the soul, proves that God cannot annihilate it in this way. If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it. God cannot dissolve that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible. The reader is requested to bear in mind that the question at this point, is not—would the soul fall back into non-existence, should God withdraw his creating and sustaining power? but—can the soul be burned up, or be annihilated by the exertion of power upon it? We will close this argument, with the following extract from Mr. Drew's essay on

the immortality of the soul. It may not be conclusive in itself, but taken in connection with our reasoning, on the immateriality of the soul, is not without its force.

"It has been already proved, that material bodies can never act but when they bring their surfaces into contact with each other. As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into contact with it: to suppose such a contact possible, is to suppose a surface in an immaterial being, which at the same time is excluded by its natural immateriality. Whatever has an exterior, must have an interior; and what has both must be extended: and what is thus extended, cannot be immaterial. An immaterial substance, therefore, can have no surface, and that which has no surface can never be brought into contact with that which has; it therefore follows that the soul must be inaccessible to all violence from matter, and that it cannot perish through its instrumentality. As matter can only act by contact, it follows that without being extended beyond its physical nature, it never can destroy the soul. And to suppose matter to be thus extended, is to suppose it to be matter and not matter at the same time. Nor can any accession of power overcome the contradiction. No acquisition of power can alter the identity of its nature, or communicate to it a force of which its nature is incapable.

"We cannot conceive that an accession of power can cause matter to accomplish everything which is placed within the reach of its nature: but to suppose matter to extend its influence beyond the limits of its own existence, or to act where it is not, is to suppose its presence and absence at the same time. And to suppose it to annihilate a nature with which it has no physical connection, is to suppose it to act where it can have no influence; or that it can act and not act at the same time; which every one must see, is not only a moral but an absolute impossibility. It therefore follows, that the soul cannot perish by the instrumentality of matter, whatever influence be attributed to the application of its power; hence in reference to every material weapon,

> "The soul, secure in her existence, smiles
> At the drawn dagger and defies its point."

"It is certain that nothing cannot *communicate* what it does not possess; nor *produce* what it has not the *power* of *producing*. A being which can communicate annihilation, must be one which is in existence, for that which is not in existence can communicate nothing: and for the same reason can produce no effects. And that being which is in existence, cannot from the *certainty of its own existence*, include the *absence of existence* within its nature, and consequently, can never communicate to another that *absence of existence* or *annihilation* which it does not possess itself. Annihilation, therefore, can never be communicated, either by a being which is in existence, or by one which is not.

"If the soul be annihilated, it must be either by something which is in existence or by something which is not. But that which is in existence, can never produce what is physically contrary to itself; and that which has no existence can never act. The power which is supposed to reduce the soul to a point of annihilation, must either exist in this given point or it must not:—if it exist we have not yet arrived at that point which describes a nonentity: and where *nonentity* is not, *annihilation* can never BE; and if it exist not in this given point, the soul can never be annihilated by its influence.

"Annihilation must be the result of power or it must not. If it be the result of power, power must continue to operate upon a subject, until the subject itself, through the influence of that power be reduced to a nonentity. But in admitting power to have an active operation, until it produces a nonentity, we admit a palpable contradiction. The admission of a power which is known to exist only because it produces a nonentity furnishes the mind with a chaos of contradictions—because that which produces a nonentity is not power but *nothing*."

The above extracts from Mr. Drew go to show that the soul cannot be annihilated, as destructionists suppose, by the punishments and pains of hell; and as it (the soul) cannot be annihilated in the way they suppose, and as their arguments all tend to prove that it will take place in this way, so far as they prove anything, their entire theory must fail. But we have got yet to consider the main point, which is the Bible doctrine on the subject.

REVIEW—No. VII.

In Mr. Lee's article No. 9, he takes up the question of "the conscious existence of the soul, after the death of the body." His argument is "from the immateriality of the soul." He tells his readers that "the foundation for this argument has been laid in preceding numbers, in which the immateriality of the human soul has been proved." Those of our readers, who have read his articles, and our Review, will doubtless be prepared to determine whether Mr. Lee has "*proved*" the "immateriality of the soul." I humbly conceive he *has not* "proved" it, nor is it in his power to "prove" it, by all the argument he can bring to bear upon the question.

Mr. Lee thinks the question has been "misunderstood," and attempts to define it more accurately. He quotes from Brother Storrs' "Six Sermons" the following paragraph:

"It is said—*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.* One single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—'Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.'"

Upon this he remarks, that "as a reply, it is defective in two particulars:"

1. It assumes that "destruction," means a loss of conscious existence, when applied to the soul;" which is "not admitted;" but, because "it belongs to another branch of the subject," he does not argue it. I will also let it pass, at present, for the same reason.

2. Mr. Lee says—"Its capital defect is, it entirely misapprehends the question." Let us see: Mr. Storrs states the argument of his opponents thus: "*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.*" There is no "misapprehension" of the question here, for Mr. Lee himself argues upon this hypothesis; and the very article I am now reviewing, is based upon this assumption.

But, perhaps, Mr. Lee alludes particularly to the latter part of this paragraph, where Mr. Storrs says "one single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—'Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell."

I apprehend that, if Mr. Lee will examine this argument again, he will find more force in it than he is disposed to admit. The radical idea of *immortality*, is, *not subject to death, or deathlessness.* It follows, therefore, that that which is *absolutely* immortal cannot be "destroyed" by any power in the universe; for, to reason otherwise, would be to make it mortal and immortal at the same time,

which is an absurdity. And hence the force of Mr. Storrs' argument—if God be "able" to "destroy" the soul, it is not *absolutely immortal*, because if immortal, it is necessarily *indestructible*. There is more argument, therefore, in Mr. Storrs' reply than Mr. Lee could perceive, or, perhaps, was willing to admit. Mr. Storrs' argument stands thus:

That which is immortal cannot be destroyed;
But God can destroy the soul;
Therefore it is not immortal.

But, I apprehend, Mr. Lee himself does not state the question as clearly as it ought to be stated. The *primary* question, and the one Mr. Lee has been discussing, is this—*is the soul naturally immortal?* Mr. Lee says *it is*; and that it is *in its nature* analogous to the *nature of God*. If so, it cannot be destroyed, because God cannot destroy himself! But God can destroy the soul, therefore it is not analogous to the nature of God—it is not immortal. Thus Mr. Storrs' argument comes back in all its original force.

We take the broad ground, first, *that the soul is naturally mortal*; second, *that he is able to destroy it*; and third, *that he* WILLS *to destroy it, if wicked*. In order, therefore, for Mr. Lee to meet this question fully in all its latitude, he must prove, *that the soul is naturally immortal—that God is not able to destroy it—and that he does not* WILL *to destroy it!* under any circumstances.

3. But, the fact is, Mr. Lee does not know what the soul is. He says "it is a *simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded*, and *indivisible*. Now, how does Mr. Lee know that the soul is "a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible?" All this is mere *assumption*, without the shadow of a shade of proof! May I not ask Mr. Lee how he knows the soul is "uncompounded and indivisible?" From whence did he get his information? for it must be based upon facts, or be a matter of revelation. If upon facts, where are *they*? And, if upon revelation, give us the proof.

But he says—"This argument is not designed to prove that God cannot destroy the human soul, nor even that he will not, but only that the soul, being spirit and not matter, simple and not compound, indivisible and not dissoluble, it must be immortal in its nature, and live after the body is dissolved; yea, live forever, unless destroyed by the Almighty power that gave it being."

Here Mr. Lee argues the immortality of the soul, upon the absurd assumption that *it is "spiritual, uncompounded and indivisible!"* What an argument! *Credat Judæus Apella.* But, after all, Mr. Lee virtually yields the question, for he does not introduce this argument to prove that God cannot, or that he will not destroy the soul! Then, pray, what is gained to his cause by his argument? I confess I can see nothing, for he says it "will live forever, *unless*," yes, "UNLESS *destroyed* by the Almighty Power that gave it existence!" Well, suppose God should "*destroy*" it, as he says he will, what then becomes of Mr. Lee's favorite doctrine? It will be as though it never had been! Moreover, in confirmation of this view of the subject, we are taught that the Lord God "*drove out*" *the* man from the Garden of Eden, lest he should partake of the tree of life, eat, and live forever, an *immortal* sinner. Immortality, being an attribute of God—"he only having immortality,"—he cannot destroy that which is immortal, because to do so would be to act contrary to himself. To prevent, therefore, such a result as would have followed the act of Adam's eating of the tree of life, he drove him out, and obstructed his way to the life-imparting tree; knowing that, if he should partake of it, he would live forever as a necessary consequence. All the evidence, then, going to prove that God is "*able*," and that he *wills* to destroy the soul of the sinner, equally disproves the "*natural immortality of the soul*."

But, I repeat it, Mr. Lee does not know what the soul is. He speaks of it as an *entity*—as a distinct thing or essence, "uncompounded" and "indivisible." But, the truth is, Mr. Lee has been discussing the merits of an *attribute*, rather than an *entity*. Life, strictly speaking, is not an *entity* but an *attribute*. Immortality is not a *thing-entity* or essence, but a *quality*, an *attribute* of the *thing* of which it is predicated. Reasoning, therefore, upon a false assumption, what a flourish of "saws," "knives" and "axes" Mr. Lee makes in his *first* paragraph. His whole argument on this point, is inconclusive and defective in the extreme, when considered in relation to the truth of his own theory! The fact is, he subverts his own hypothesis, as we shall presently see.

Mr. Lee concludes from his reasoning on the "immateriality of the soul," that "God cannot destroy it, in the manner in which destructionists suppose." Further on he says—"God cannot dissolve that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible." Thus Mr. Lee's own reasoning brings us back to the point, that, if the soul be immortal, it will, by a necessity of its own nature, live forever. But, as God has declared that, "the soul that sins shall die," it follows, as a necessary consequence, that it is not immortal; and, therefore, that it can be destroyed by an "exertion of power upon it;" and also, by being left to the operation of its own laws, as in the case of Adam.

Having subverted his own theory, Mr. Lee invokes the aid of Mr. Drew to effect its annihilation! Mr. Drew's first sentence is a *death-blow* to Mr. Lee's whole argument on the fancied "immortality of the soul!" Mr. Drew says—and Mr. Lee endorses it—"It has been already proved, that material bodies can never act but when they bring their surfaces into contact with each other!" This may have been deemed sound reasoning in the days of Mr. Drew, but, at the present time, every school boy of ordinary intelligence, knows better. Mr. Lee appears to have been asleep for a quarter of a century, without even *dreaming* in the time; and now that he is waked up he supposes every thing is just like it was when he fell asleep! He is waked up in the wrong place! and supposes himself living a quarter of a century past; and, consequently, speaks and reasons in harmony with the ideas which he obtained at that time! But he is behind the age, or else he would never have endorsed the sentence already quoted. Mr. Drew continues: "As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into contact with it," &c.

I am willing to submit it to the reader, yea, to Mr. Lee himself, whether Mr. Drew has not *disproved* the very position he intended to establish! Let the reader remember, then, that Mr. Drew and

Mr. Lee regard it as "a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into *contact* with" that which is "immaterial." It follows, therefore, from their own principles, that, as the body is matter, and the soul, in *their estimation*, is "immaterial," *they can never be brought into contact!* They, therefore, have no *connection* whatever! If this argument is not *suicidal*, there is no truth in the universe. According to this absurd and "vain philosophy," God, being "immaterial" in their view of the subject, can have no connection with the universe of matter he has created. I hesitate not to say, that this opinion is atheistical in its tendency, and absurd and monstrous in fact!

Mr. Lee, by endorsation, says—"Whatever has an exterior, must have an interior; and what has both must be extended: and what is thus extended cannot be immaterial." Mr. Lee, by the aid of Mr. Drew, has clearly proved, admitting the correctness of their reasoning, that the soul is *nothing!* The following is their description of it: It is "simple," "uncompounded," "indivisible," "indissoluble;" without "exterior" or "interior surface," is not "extended," and "can never come into *contact with matter!*" Thus they have, by laboring to make the *soul* everything, reduced it to *nothing!* They have proved the very point we at first stated, viz.; *That that which is immaterial is nothing—it is a nonentity!*

And, just at this point, let me ask Mr. Lee a few questions: Upon your hypothesis, was the "immaterial soul," as you will have it, created of the dust, or breathed into the nostrils of Adam? If created of the dust, it is not "immaterial;" and, if breathed into his nostrils, it had "extension"—"surface," and necessarily came in "*contact with* matter:" and is, therefore, not "*im*-material!"

Again, how many "immaterial souls" did God create in the beginning? How many had Adam? How many had Eve? Did they have more than *one* each? If they had only *one* each, whence have their numerous offspring derived theirs? You say it is "indivisible" and "indissoluble," consequently it is not *transmissible!* And that which is *transmissible* comes in "contact with matter;" but you say the "immaterial" soul "cannot come into contact with matter;" therefore it is not transmitted; and, consequently, unless God creates an "immaterial soul" for every child born, the offspring of Adam have *no* "immaterial soul"—ERGO, in your opinion, *they have no soul at all!* So Adam, according to the working of your philosophy, has given birth to a *soulless progeny!* Thus Mr. Lee, in attempting to prove that men have "immaterial souls," has actually proved that they have none at all!

The remainder of Mr. Lee's article abounds in the same sort of logic; it is suicidal in reference to his own theory! If Mr. Lee can reason no better than this upon his favorite view, he will murder his own cause, and bury it so deep, that no mortal hand shall ever be able to disinter it!

It would be a waste of time to extend the review of this article any further; but the reader, who is curious to see how completely Mr. Lee subverts his own theory, is referred to the article itself.

In conclusion, let me say, that Mr. Lee is utterly unable to sustain his theory by such arguments as he has adduced in the above article; nor do I believe that the man lives who can do it, by any sort of argumentation within the grasp of mortal intellect.

We fall back upon the conclusion, established alike by philosophy and revelation, that man is mortal in every part; and that immortality is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead!

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"*He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*"—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We have now exhausted all the funds we have to publish the Examiner. We are in debt to our subscribers, who have paid for this volume, four numbers more, which we intend they shall have if we can contrive any way to pay the printer; till then our friends must not look for the Examiner's *regular* monthly visits. We regret that we are brought to this necessity, but "the destruction of the poor is their poverty;" so we submit. We can still furnish the back numbers of the Examiner from January 1848. About three hundred new subscribers for the present year would give us the means to complete this volume; and we can furnish that number with the Examiner from January last; here we leave the matter.

ANY PERSON who will send us one dollar, current money, free of expense, for the Examiner for 1850, *i. e.* for Vol. V. before the middle of December next, we will, on the receipt of the money, send them one copy of Dobney on Future Punishment, in paper cover; *or*, three copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo; that is—the pamphlet of 120 pages; and if the Examiner is not published next year, we will send, instead of it, two more copies of Dobney; *or*, eight of the Six Sermons, as they shall choose. Please state distinctly in all cases which you will have. This proposition cannot apply out of the United States.

LOOK AT THIS.—One of our monthly exchanges, printed on paper about the same quality as our own, with 40 pages to the number, exceeding the Examiner in amount of matter only as 70 exceeds 42, that is, to use a printer's phrase, it has 70 thousand *ems*, whilst the Examiner has but 42 thousand, is $2 per year in advance. Each number has a paper cover, and so the postage is 3½ cents instead of one, or 1½, like the Examiner. Now look at the following statement. This monthly exchange gives its readers 840 thousand *ems* annually, at a cost to the subscriber of $2 42 cents, including postage: we now give 504 thousand *ems* at a cost to subscribers of from 62 to 68 cents!! We propose to give our subscribers for 1850 a semi-monthly, which will make one million and eight thousand *ems*, [1,008,000] or an excess over our exchange of

168 thousand *ems*, and all at a cost, including postage, of from $1 24 to $1 36 cents, or about one half the price of our exchange, provided we receive two thousand paying subscribers for the next year. But if we publish only once each month, as now, and yet increase the price of the Examiner to $1 00, we shall then give you nearly five-eighths as much matter as our exchange gives for *less than half the money*.

Books by Mail.—Our friends who order *bound* books sent by mail are informed, by law they "are not mailable matter;" and our Post Office will not forward them. We have had several calls to send bound Hymn Books and Sermons by mail: we cannot do it. *Please remember this.*

The Immortality Discussion.—Br. Lee, of the True Wesleyan, has nearly finished his side of the question. The Wesleyan of July 14 contained three numbers on the subject; in reference to which the Editor says—"This week's paper contains the whole of the direct argument against annihilation, at, or subsequently to the resurrection;" and he asks "particular attention to this argument;" and adds—"We believe it to be unanswerable, though we are liable to over value our own argument; at least, we could not answer it to our own satisfaction, and that is our rule of testing an argument." We thank Br. Lee for this very candid confession: we should not expect he could answer two sides of any question to his own satisfaction at the same time. We have been in a similar position sometimes ourself; but further light has shown us that we could answer our previous argument to our entire satisfaction. And we think Br. Lee may yet, with the light that shall be shed on his path, be able to answer his own argument to his entire "satisfaction," so far as he has stated the argument of his opponents clearly; which he has by no means done in all cases. His favorite phrase is "*annihilation;*" with that he and our opponents generally try to make a sound; and many minds are more affected by sound than sense. Let any one, even Br. Lee himself, read over his entire argument and substitute *death* for his unscriptural and unwarantable word "annihilation," which we never use, and the largest portion of his argument will be found powerless. Just here we cannot forbear giving an extract from a letter we received from the late Orange Scott, *founder* of the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America." Writing us not many months after the first appearance of our views, in 1841, he says:

"S*** has been out against you; and, two weeks ago, B**** preached, or rather read a labored discourse against you. It was full of sophistry! and so are P*****'s articles!! and so is every thing I have yet seen against you!!! You must, however, expect something when Lee comes out, for he can make a lie appear like the truth. You are likely to have work enough to answer all who oppose you; but you have put your hand to the plow and must not look back."

Br. Lee seems to lay considerable stress upon the opinions of "*the fathers*" in this controversy, so we have thought to give him a specimen of the opinion of *a* father of the Wesleyans in America. The letter of Br. O. Scott was written to us before we had put forth the strength which the Lord afterwards gave us, by which he enabled us to bring out the "Six Sermons:" those were not preached till a year later; and to use Br. Lee's language, "We believe" the main positions of our Six Sermons are "unanswerable;" sure we are Br. Lee has not answered them; "though we are liable to over value, our own argument." Br. Lee has put forth his strength; and we acknowledge that we expected if any man could show us to be in error, that man was Brother Lee; but skilful as he is both in logic and "sophistry," in our judgment, he has utterly failed, this once, to make the pagan fable [we will not say "*lie*"] "look like the truth." So far from it, that we now consider the matter settled firmer than ever before, that man has *no immortality out of Christ;* and *no future life except by a resurrection from the dead;* and, also, that "*all the wicked will God destroy*"—"THEY SHALL BE AS THOUGH THEY HAD NOT BEEN:" *Ob.* 16. Call that "*annihilation*" if *you will:* it is what God says of the wicked, in plain words, in opposition to all pagan, papal, and protestant *inferences.* We rejoice that Br. Lee has made this last effort; and we wish to make no other reply, ourself, than what is contained in our Six Sermons and views on the intermediate state as found in our 18mo. pamphlet; we will risk that with Br. Lee's "unanswerable argument" the world over, and have no fears for the result in any mind not bound by sectarianism. Our Associate Editor will, of course, finish his Review of Br. Lee's argument so soon as we shall have the means to publish it; and if the "unanswerable argument" is not thoroughly answered and its fallacy fully shown to the "satisfaction" of others, if not to Br. Lee's mind, we are greatly mistaken.

Note.—We wish it distinctly understood, that Br. Scott's reference to Br. Lee related *only* to his logical and controversial powers; not that Br. Scott or we ever had an idea that Br. Lee would knowingly attempt to make a *lie* look like the truth, but that such is his skill, that if he took the side of error, he could make it seem truth.

The Atonement.—We have heard that some persons have busied themselves in reporting that "Br. Storrs denies the atonement:" and some, we fear, under the garb of professed friendship, have helped on this falsehood by *insinuating* their fears that we deny the atonement. If you read the Ex-

aminer you need have no fears but that you will know our belief, for we have not shunned to declare our views on any Scripture subject when we thought there was a call for it. Br. E. Miller, Jr., has written on the subject of the atonement in the Advent Harbinger, and we are gratified to see that he advocates the same view that we expressed in the Examiner as long ago as April, 1848. We have not hesitated to express them publicly and privately since. We have no room to enlarge now, though we had intended to do so soon. But those who have read the articles in the late numbers of the Harbinger, by Br. E. Miller, may regard these views as substantially our own. We believe Christ died for our sins, but not in the sense of "*paying our debts*," nor "*in our room and stead*:" if so, universal salvation inevitably follows; and it is mockery to ask God to *forgive* our sins when the debt is paid. Some men's theology converts the God of love into a demon, and then deprives him of all exercise of the glorious prerogative of "*forgiving iniquity, transgression and sins.*" We believe they do it "ignorantly in unbelief," being blinded by the creeds and traditions of men. May the Lord *forgive* them.

PREACHING every Lord's day, morning and evening, at the Saloon of "TEMPERANCE HALL," Third Street, below Green, west side, by the Editors of the Examiner.

CHOLERA—We are living in the midst of this sweeping scourge. Several of our Congregation have been attacked by it and suffered severely. We have been called to mourn its fatal visitation in the loss of our beloved brother James Masson, who died July 14th. Br. Masson was an every day christian—one of the right sort. He was always in his place in our public worship. He was one of our earliest friends in this city, and could always be depended upon. It is sad to see his place vacant. Great as the loss is to the Church, it is greater still to a large family of children, and other relations, to whom he was *a father indeed*; and to add to their affliction, Sister Masson, whose health has long been feeble, followed her husband in a few days to to the silent grave; and thus are their household, almost with one stroke, deprived of both father and mother. Two more consistent christians are seldom met with: their last end was peace—they fell asleep in Jesus in the full hope that they would be awaked by him at his appearing and kingdom. Happy they who are always ready.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

No. I.

The Saviour inquired of the hypocritical Pharisees and Sadducees, "How is it that ye cannot discern the signs of the times?" This inquiry implies that the indications of the times, if carefully observed and inquired after, will show clearly the position we occupy in the world's history, and need not be mistaken. The times in which men live are to determine, in a great measure, their course of conduct; for it will appear in the course of our remarks that what may be proper and right to be done in one age, or in one period of an individual's life, may be exceedingly improper and wrong to be done in another age or period. We may illustrate this truth in various ways. For example—A mariner may go to sea at once, when his vessel is loaded, if wind and tide favor him, and there are no indications of a disastrous storm about to burst over him; but should such indications appear, so apparent as not to be mistaken by a careful observer of the signs, would he do well to disregard them, and rush out to sea, perilling all, rather than delay the commencement of his voyage? And if he should thus disregard the signs of the coming storm, and launch forth, and is wrecked and all lost in the tempest, is he not justly stigmatized as a fool for his course? And is he not blame-worthy? Did not Paul censure the Centurion of the vessel which carried him prisoner to Rome, because he disregarded the sign he had given him, that if he loosed from a certain port it would be attended with loss and damage? See Acts xxvi. Again—The farmer, when about to gather in his crops, or the fruits of the earth, carefully watches the signs of the weather, waiting for favorable indications to reap down his fields. He will not be guilty of the folly of reaping down his ripe grain, when there are indications of a storm immediately upon him. He watches with care and solicitude signs to satisfy his mind as to the course he is to pursue, and he is governed in his operations by the conclusions at which he arrives in his observations. Does he not act wisely in doing so?

Let us now take Scripture illustrations. Of Noah it is said, Heb. xi., 7, "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith."

Noah was "warned" of a coming flood, or had some sign or token, by word or otherwise, of that coming event. He heeded it, and prepared an ark to the saving of his house; and we all say he was wise in doing so. But suppose he had disregarded the sign, or warning, would he not have perished with the ungodly? And we here remark, to illustrate the principle we laid down at the outset, that though it might have been very proper and right for Noah to have bought land and built houses before he received the warning or sign of the flood, it would have been folly and madness for him to do so afterwards, and full evidence that he did not believe the flood was coming. And what a sorry sight it would have been for Noah to be preaching a flood at hand, and instead of giving his attention to building the ark, had spent his time in buying farms, building houses, factories, railroads, or hunting for gold mines. Surely a scoffing world might justly have said he was either a hypocrite or a fool.

Let us look at another case: Heb. xi., 24–26, "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people

of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season: esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward."

Moses understood the signs of the times. He knew the period of the bondage of Abraham's seed "in a land not theirs" was near its accomplishment: and he understood that the nation that oppressed them about that time was to be "*judged*," and Israel brought out, or delivered. Observing these signs of the times, he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; or, refused the throne of Egypt, the pleasures of which he saw could only be enjoyed for a season. At a previous period, and under different circumstances, it might have been right and proper for Moses to occupy a place at Pharaoh's court; but the time had come—the signs had appeared—that Egypt was to be judged and Israel delivered. If Moses believed this, could he consistently continue at Pharaoh's court, and acknowledge himself the son of Pharaoh's daughter? Hitherto there had been no harm or wrong in his doing so; but now the case is different. Has he "*faith*" in God's word or not? He has; and changes his course of life, and departs from a position he could no longer occupy with safety. It is true he was guilty of an act of indiscretion, but even that was overruled to separate him from a position that to him was full of danger. When Moses came from his forty years retirement in Midian to demand of Pharaoh to let Israel go, suppose in connection with that demand he had daily been bargaining with the Egyptians to buy their land, and contracting with them to build him houses; would that have been consistent with his professed faith that God was about to plant Israel in the land of Canaan—the promised land? Surely such a course would have been highly inconsistent; yet it might have been perfectly proper in the early part of Moses' life, but the signs of the times forbid it now.

We take another example. When the Jews were carried away captive into Babylon for seventy years, God, at the commencement of their captivity, expressly commanded them to build houses in Babylon, and dwell in them, and seek the peace of the city where they might dwell. See Jer. xxix. Hence it was right, proper, and their duty, to do so at that time. But, by and bye, the times indicate that they are soon to return to Palestine:—would it now be proper for them to be purchasing fields and building houses to dwell in, as if they were still to continue in Babylon? True, many of them did; and of course did not return with their brethren who went up out of captivity: they had no faith or no inclination to share the fortunes of their brethren who left Babylon to return to Jerusalem. Did they act faith in God's promise of restoration? We have introduced this case as illustrating our principle, that what may be right and proper to be done at one time is neither right nor proper at another; and would be a mark of great folly if not of wickedness.

We might illustrate our principle with other examples, but we judge these are sufficient for our purpose: we proceed, therefore, with the application. The Lord Jesus Christ is to return to this earth, and is to receive the throne of his father David; the present age is to end, and a new order of things is to be established on earth. We shall not stop here to prove these points, believing that a large portion of our readers embrace them as settled truths, though they may differ somewhat as to the order and character of the events of the coming age, while nearly all of them will admit that a very great change is coming over the world. Believing, then, that the personal advent of Christ to this earth the second time, and that a great change is to take place in the world at that time, are events to be realised at some period; and seeing great convulsions now going on in the earth, does it not become us to be wise, and inquire what those commotions indicate? or of what times are they the signs? And if satisfied that they are signs of the "kingdom of God" being "nigh at hand"—that fifth universal empire so clearly exhibited in Dan. ii. and vii., and shadowed forth in the Book of Revelation—does it not become us to regulate our pursuits and course of life in agreement with such evidence and such a revolution as the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth implies? We should not suppose any sane man could give any other than an affirmative answer. The point then to settle is—do the events of the times in which we live indicate the soon bringing in of the kingdom of God, or reign of Christ personally upon the earth? In answering this inquiry we do not design to go formally over the prophecies that relate to the four first universal monarchies set forth in Dan. ii. and vii., as those topics have been to the minds of most of our readers often fully presented, and there can remain no reasonable doubt but those four monarchies have had their day, and passed away, and that we have been for many centuries in the divided state of the fourth; *i. e.* Europe divided into a number of petty monarchies, amazingly controlled by a mongrel power, symbolized by a "horn having eyes as a man." This power being acknowledged by all Protestants to be the *Politico*-Ecclesiastical power of Rome. This power is again symbolized in Rev. xiii., by a beast rising up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns. This description marks the time of the development of the politico-ecclesiastical power of Rome as coming into existence in the divided state of the fourth, or Roman empire, when kingly governments were in existence, as the crowns upon the horns indicate. In the seventeenth chapter of Rev. we are presented with another aspect of the same power: it is the politico-ecclesiastical power of Rome, after some of the kingly powers of the divided Roman empire have fallen, so that the scarlet colored beast there, though it has seven heads and ten horns, is presented without any mention of crowns at all; perhaps not because it had no crowns on any of its horns, but because some of them had become *republican* at the time "the judgment of the great whore" is to take place. It is evident John was shown that power at a period just prior to its destruction, and while the seventh vial of the seven last plagues was being poured out. At that time he was shown a corrupt woman [a corrupt ecclesiastical power] sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, [a bloody secular or civil power] full of names of blasphemy. To mark its location on earth it has seven heads and ten horns, showing that it is Roman, and can answer to no other power in existence than the Papal, civil and ecclesiastical power combined, as seen in the symbol of a corrupt woman riding and directing a bloody beast, in a time when repub-

licanism had been established in some of the horn kingdoms. If this view is correct, it fixes the time of this aspect of the Papal power to the period since France, "the eldest son of" that corrupt "church," became republican; or subsequent to February 1848.

This corrupt woman, who has a name written upon her forehead, "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH," was riding and governing the beast that had been in the bottomless pit, but ascended out of it just prior to the aspect of it presented in this 17th chapter. The same power under another aspect, in Rev. 13th, went into *captivity*, or *descended* into the bottomless pit; this was done in the days of Napoleon Bonaparte, when for a time the Papal power was stript of all its civil authority; but afterwards this beast was re-instated or *ascended* out of the bottomless pit, though under another aspect: it was the "eighth" king, though in fact "of the seven;" i. e. it is the same power as the beast of Rev. 13th with seven heads, &c., but had now taken its last form. In this last form the beast, or civil power of Papacy, would be brought into circumstances calling for the *intervention* of the other civil powers, symbolized by the horns, and they should have one mind, and should give their power and strength unto the *beast*, not to the woman; but to strengthen and establish the papal civil power. And what do we see at this very time? One of the strangest and most astonishing events that has ever been recorded on the pages of history, viz. a nation just emerged from monarchy and thrown the crown from its horn in contempt, volunteers by her rulers, to restore the Pope to his *civil* power; and in doing this, that nation is seen *agreeing* with the despots of Europe to reinstate the Pope in his civil power, i. e. they "agree and give their power and strength to the scarlet colored beast!!" But mark well, this is only to be done "till the words of God shall be fulfilled:" for, before this conflict is over, there will be a hatred kindled up against the woman—the ecclesiastical power of papacy—which shall only be quenched by eating her flesh and burning her with fire. The woman includes the city where her abominations have been concocted, and from whence they have been carried into execution; and also, most likely, all those kings of the earth, or old Roman empire, that have committed fornication with her, by upholding her spiritual wickedness and bloody persecutions. Hence we are of opinion that Rome itself, i. e. the city, will be utterly destroyed in the conflict, as was ancient Babylon, which was a type of it; and then one principal city after another, whose rulers were in the agreement to re-establish papal civil authority, will meet with a like destruction; and most likely Paris will be the second in the fall, and so on till they are all overthrown, and Europe is a desolation, as the prophecy clearly indicates it will be. This, of course, brings in that state of anarchy which we understand the scriptures clearly to teach as immediately preceding the establishment of a fifth universal monarchy—the kingdom of God—or the personal reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, which Jehovah has promised to give him, in spite of the rage of kings and rulers of the earth of whatever form their governments may be.

We do not feel justified, till we shall have further developments, in going more into details, or particulars, of coming events. The details may vary from any of our calculations, but the great fact that the scarlet-colored beast is soon to go into perdition, or be utterly destroyed, together with the woman who has been its rider, and that the reign of Christ is soon to follow, to our mind, admits not of a doubt. It may, however, be several years, and probably will be, before the whole work is accomplished; but it is nevertheless *now* in a state of accomplishment.

We may give more on this matter at another time, but rest here for this month. If these things are so, can we live in the same course of management of our temporal affairs that might have been justifiable and proper before the signs of the times indicated that this age is drawing to a close, and that the kingdom of God and the reign of Christ on earth and under the whole heaven is about to be opened? Let conscience do its work, and let us see to it that we do not slight its warning voice in these perilous times.

July 4th, 1849.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

FIRST QUESTION.—"How do you harmonize Zech. 14th with Matt. 13: 37—43?" S. W. G.

We suppose this question relates to the fact that Zech. 14, represents that there are persons "left of the nations" who, evidently, are in a state of trial after the advent of Christ, and in that day when "The LORD shall be king over all the earth:" while Matt. 13, seems to convey the idea of the entire destruction of the wicked at the end of the age, or at the time of the second advent of Christ. The 14th of Zech. is too plain and positive on the fact that there will be left of the nations, after the advent, who are in a probationary state, to be disproved either by argument or sophistry, however skillfully managed. We do not believe that a soul who has attempted to explain away that view, has ever satisfied himself yet, for any length of time. It is an impregnable fortress against all and every class of advocates for the termination of probation to all men, without regard to their circumstances for hearing and knowing the truth, at the end of this age. No language could make the subject plainer than that used by the prophet Zechariah, that a state of trial to some of the inhabitants of earth will be continued after "the Lord my God shall come and all the saints [holy ones] with thee."

Our Lord, Matt. 13th, is speaking only of a *specified class* of wicked men, symbolized by "*tares*," and those too in a specified *location*, viz. "AMONG the wheat;" and they grew "TOGETHER" *with* the wheat; and so nearly *resemble* it, that men, in the present age, have not sufficient judgment to be entrusted with the work of rooting them up. The original word, "tares," signifies "*bastard wheat*;" it resembles genuine wheat, and is scattered *among* it. The symbol therefore shows the class of wicked persons spoken of are *professors* of religion, and that they are *in* the nominal churches; the parable relates to them, and to them only. In relation to such wicked *professors*, with which the devil has filled professedly christian churches, from various motives, such as *respectability*; to get on better *in business*; and to cover up their wickedness under the cloak of religion, we have no idea that they will be of the number "*left*" of whom Zechariah speaks. They are "children of the wicked one"—

his offspring, or the fruit of his producing: "the harvest" for them "is the end of the world"—*aionos*—*age*: the end of the age that precedes the second advent, or personal reign of Messiah. Then they who have imposed upon true christians, and been a "*scandal*" to the cause of pure christianity, will meet with judgment, symbolized by being cast into a furnace of fire: their hypocrisy and wickedness exposed, and themselves cut off under circumstances of shame and anguish which will be a standing monument of God's abhorrence of all such characters. All this has nothing to do with those not included in this specified class; and the fact that our Lord adds—"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," shows there is somebody "left" for them to *shine upon*; and we are not left in the dark as to whom they are to enlighten, viz. "Every one that is left of the *nations*," contradistinguished from the nominal churches who have been judged.

SECOND QUESTION.—"Is the city of Zech. and of Rev. 20, the camp of the saints, and that of Rev. 21, which John saw come down from heaven, all one?" S. W. G.

If we understand this question, we answer, *no*. And with present light, we believe them to be three distinct cities; or, three distinct periods of time are covered by their history. Zechariah's being at a period somewhere prior to the advent, without now attempting to define that period: Rev. 20th being during the thousand years; Rev. 21st, after the thousand years; or, if during the thousand years, then to be regarded simply as a symbol of the glorified church, shining "forth as the sun," as the great city of Babylon was previously a symbol of a corrupt, persecuting, and destroying church. The latter being utterly destroyed, or "burned with fire," the pure and glorified church takes its place on earth, to bless those that are left of the nations, and spread its light and glory on all around, as the corrupt church had scattered darkness and spread a curse on earth's inhabitants before.

THIRD QUESTION.—"Will the saying of Peter, 3d chap., take place at the advent or towards the evening of the day of the Lord?" S. W. G.

We infer that this question relates to what Peter says of "The heavens and earth which are now" being "kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." If Peter is speaking of the literal heavens and earth being dissolved by fire, it must, we think, clearly relate to the close of the day of the Lord, as it is an event connected with the "judgment and perdition of ungodly men:" this, certainly, is not universal till the end of the thousand years. See Rev. 20: 11—15.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS.

EPHESIANS, CHAP. V.

The apostle now proceeds to caution them against a class of sins which he thus enumerates.

VERSE 3. But fornication, and uncleanness, or covetousnes, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints.

"Fornication"—to which the Gentiles were notoriously addicted, even in connection with the worship of their gods, thus putting a religious sanction upon that abominable sin—"and all uncleanness"—all *impurity*—"or, covetousness"—*pleonesia*—same word translated "*greediness*," chap. iv. 19; signifying "*inordinate desires*." It may relate to any object; whether money, food, drink, dress, or furniture, or whatever may be used for the gratification of the senses, or animal nature: "let it not once be named"—mentioned, heard of, or known—"among you"—let them have no existence in your midst—"as becometh saints"—those who by profession are *holy*.

VERSE 4. Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient; but rather giving of thanks.

"Filthiness." The word signifies anything indecent or obscene—"nor foolish"—simple, useless—"talking"—which benefits none and may injure the talker and hearer—"nor jesting"—the primary signification of the word is *politeness*; but it is used to signify, jesting, buffoonery, scurrility, or low, vulgar abusive language. It is quite as likely the apostle uses the word here to speak against that mock and hypocritical politeness which is so common in people destitute of real love to their fellow men, who seek to make up for it in professions and unmeaning compliments: but, he says, such things "are not convenient"—*anekonta*—are not fit, not becoming, not proper, ought not to be. "Not convenient" is a very tame translation: as though men might do it, if it were only "convenient!" It is evidently a prohibition—a course of conduct *not fit* for imitators of God and Christ. "But rather giving of thanks." The word here seems to signify not the giving of thanks, in the ordinary sense, but —"decorous or instructive conversation"—the opposite of the conversation just censured.

VERSE 5. For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, or covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

On this verse we need not remark, except again to call attention to what is said of the "covetous man"—he "is an idolater." We ask the reader to look again at our remark on verse 3, as to what constitutes a covetous person. Such persons are now denominated idolaters; and with propriety. That object of sense, which a person sets his mind upon *inordinately*, that is, immoderately, to excess, or disorderly—becomes his god: he is under its government—pays it the homage of obedience; looks to it as the object of his supreme happiness. Though he, himself, may not be aware of it, through blindness of mind, yet his life and conversation will make it manifest where his heart is. Listen to the conversation of many professing to be seeking a treasure in "the kingdom of God;" what do you hear? Alas! Balls, parties, dress, food, drinks, sensual gratifications, furniture, houses, lands, gold, dollars, offices, honors, &c., &c., all tending to show that they have those inordinate desires which constitute them the covetous persons, who Paul says are "idolaters," and who shall have no "inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." Fearful words! Who has not cause of alarm? "Whose conversation is in heaven?" Who really manifest, by all their course of life, that they esteem the love of God and Christ, and an "inheritance in the kingdom," of more importance to them than all animal gratifications put together?

VERSE 6. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

This verse is too emphatic to need comment. If any man attempt to make you think these inordinate desires are harmless, beware that you are not *deceived* by them: God's judgment will fall on all such.

VERSE 7. Be not ye therefore partakers with them.

Be not *partakers* with them. If partakers with them in their wicked practices, you will be also in their exclusion from the kingdom of God, and in that wrath that is to come upon them.

VERSE 8. For ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.

"Ye were sometime"—in time past—*formerly*—"darkness"—used figuratively for *ignorance*: that is, "Ye were formerly ignorant of the wicked character and ruinous end of the course of life you were in"—"but now are ye light"—used figuratively for *knowledge;* that is, "Ye have now knowledge in regard to those things"—"in the Lord"—by that "word of truth" which has been preached to you, by which you have been brought into union with the Lord, so as to be "*partakers* of the divine nature;" thus, dwelling in light; therefore, "walk as children of light"—let your course of life correspond with the knowledge and truth ye have received.

VERSE 9. For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousnes, and truth.

It is by the Spirit of God that spiritual light, truth, or knowledge has been communicated, through prophets, apostles, and Jesus Christ, and its direct operations in the mind by the word of truth: and the fruit it produces is the opposite of the fruit of ignorance in which they formerly had their course of life: it is "in all goodness and righteousness"—piety to God, sanctity of life, "and truth"—verity, in opposition to what is false or wrong—it signifies, also, *sincerity*. Such is the character of the "new creature," or spiritual nature which is brought out by the Spirit in such as do not grieve and quench it.

VERSE 10. Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord.

"Proving"—*try, examine* by the light—the word of truth—ye have received—"what is acceptable"—*well-pleasing* "unto the Lord."

VERSE 11. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

"Have no fellowship"—no communion or participation "with the unfruitful"—*noxious, destructive* "works of darkness"—or ignorance; such as described in the previous verses: "but rather"—*the more* [walking in the light, and in obedience to the word of truth] "reprove," *rebuke*, or convince "them:" that is, show them that their way is destruction.

VERSE 12. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

This verse needs no comment.

VERSE 13. But all things that are reproved are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light.

"All things that are reproved"—discovered—"are made manifest," or discovered, "by the light"—by the knowledge, or divine illumination imparted to men: "for whatsoever doth make manifest"—or discovers to men the sinfulness of sin, and its dangerous consequence, "is light"—is divine knowledge, or illumination.

VERSE 14. Wherefore he saith, Awake, though that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.

"Awake"—*egeirai*—to *arouse* one's self to a better course of conduct—"thou that sleepest"—that art slothful, careless, secure in sin—"and arise from the dead"—used figuratively to denote their destitution of divine life—"and Christ shall give thee light"—shall shine upon you. Light here is equivalent to life. "Sinner arouse thyself—break off from sin—rest not in thy destitution of divine life—look to Christ—he came that you might have life, and that you might have it more abundantly; pursuing this course you shall receive that life, and thus gain eternal life, which is given unto us in Christ, and in him alone."

VERSE 15. See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise.

"See," take heed, take care, be cautious—"then, that ye walk"—that you live—"circumspectly"—accurately, or assiduously—"not as fools"—*asophoi*—unwise, foolish, destitute of true wisdom, pagan; *i. e.*, in the practices he had warned them against—"but as wise"—those possessed of *true knowledge*, even that "light," or illumination, which "Christ gives" to those who receive spiritual life from him, when they arouse themselves from that careless and slothful state of sin spoken of in the previous verse.

VERSE 16. Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.

"Redeeming"—use, employ,—"the time, because the days are evil"—*i. e.* calamitous, afflicting, distressing: therefore, make the best of them—use, or employ them to the best advantage.

VERSE 17. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is.

"Therefore"—because the days are evil—"be ye not unwise"—ignorant, or destitute of true knowledge—that is, the knowledge of the truths herein presented to your minds—"but understand what the will"—purpose, design, intention—"of the Lord is." That purpose, design, and intention is, that we should be holy—separate from all those wicked practices and dispositions before enumerated—and that we should be filled with divine knowledge and love, that God's full design and intention may be fulfilled in our "adoption of children to himself by Jesus Christ." "How glorious is the design and purpose of God to those who embrace his plan to become holy and unblamable before him in love. Let us understand it and act accordingly.

VERSE 18. And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit.

"Wherein is excess"—prodigality, debauchery, rioting:—"but be filled with the Spirit"—or spirit of holiness. The use of intoxicating drinks brings men under their animal nature, and prepares them for debauchery, rioting, &c. Being filled with the Spirit, raises them superior to the control and slavery of animal, or, merely sensual gratifications; and thus giving the spiritual nature the predominance they rise in the strength of divine life, and ripen for the adoption, or immortality, incorrupti-

bility, endless life. Instead, therefore, of seeking such light and transitory enjoyments as arise from the intoxicating stimulants, to which so many resort, give yourselves to spiritual joys.

VERSE 19. Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.

"Speaking"—*lalountes*—recounting, setting forth, narrating, reciting, declaring, [see the song of Moses, and Miriam, Exodus 15, for an illustration] —"to yourselves"—that is one to another—"in psalms and hymns"—sacred poetry in opposition to the light trash used by such as seek only the gratification of the animal senses—"and spiritual songs—making melody in your heart"—mind; the understanding employed as well as the voice, if we would make melody "to the Lord." How much solemn mockery we have reason to fear there is even in professedly religious assemblies: how much melody of voice with no correspondence in the mind. Let us beware of such hypocrisy.

VERSE 20. Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All we need to remark on this verse is the manner in which thanks are to be offered to God. "In the name"—signifying in, through, or by, *the person* "of our Lord Jesus Christ." He is the head of our spiritual creation, as we have before shown —no man can come unto the Father but by him: it is in virtue of our relation to him, or union with him, that we are pleasing to God; and our only way of access, by prayer or *praise*, is by being in Christ —one with him by that spiritual relation which constitutes us members of "his body, his flesh, and his bones," [verse 30;] that is, God regards us with approbation, or our prayers or praises, only as they proceed from us as *of the person* of Jesus Christ, HIS well-beloved Son. Thus appearing, He accepts both our prayers and praises as if they arose from Christ in person; and they really are such, because they are the out-breathings of that "one spirit" that animates his body, and gives vitality, or spiritual life to the whole in connection with its head, Jesus Christ.

EVENTS FUTURE.

BY HENRY E. CARVER.

BRO. STORRS,—With you, I also believe that there are events, and momentous events too, in the history of the world to transpire ere that "same Jesus" shall stand upon the Mount of Olives, as brought to view in Zech. xiv. 4, and yet I am also clearly convinced that we may reasonably expect a *speedy deliverance* from this corruptible state, to that incorruptibility consequent on the resurrection of those who sleep in Jesus, and the *change* of those who are alive and remain; so that while I look forward, perhaps years, for the fulfilment of Zech. xiv., yet I do believe that it is our privilege to expect the speedy redemption of the body.

In order to harmonize what may seem inconsistent in this, permit me to call your attention to some of the circumstances attending the descent of the Son of Man to earth the second time. The prophet speaking of the day when his feet shall stand upon the Mount of Olives, says: "*and the Lord my God* SHALL COME, *and all the Saints* WITH THEE." Again, the apostle declares that it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that *when* He shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and again, "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, THEN shall ye also appear *with him in glory*." From the above texts we are clearly taught that the saints will be *perfected* before the descent of Jesus to the place from which he was taken up, for if they are like him when he appears, and appear *with him* IN GLORY, it is evident that they must have been resurrected or changed, and their vile bodies fashioned like unto his own glorious body, prior to that appearing. This subject is more clearly presented in 1 Thess. iv. 13, 17, where, after warning them against ignorance, concerning them that sleep in Jesus, the apostle says—"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring *with him*" (Jesus.) Here we have it distinctly stated that when God shall send Jesus, whom the heavens have so long retained, those who now sleep in Jesus will come *with* him. I am aware that this is in conflict with the generally received opinion respecting the order of events at the coming of Christ; but the apostle proceeds to give an explanation of the matter, and dissipates from my mind every vestige of difficulty and darkness, and opens to my view the way in which every jot and tittle of the "Word" will have its perfect accomplishment. The apostle proceeds to explain—"For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven (where to?) with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Here, then, the matter is set plainly before us. When the Lord descends from heaven with a shout, &c., it is not to earth; neither is there an intimation that the world see him *then*, but he descends to where his Saints meet him—*in the clouds*, thus leaving ample space for the fulfilment of scripture between the resurrection and the appearing with all his Saints on the Mount.

Having suggested the subject to your mind, I now leave it with you to canvass; and by searching the scriptures to see whether there be light in it. To me it is plain that the resurrection does precede the appearing of Jesus, and thus, while I rejoice in the hope of *speedy* redemption, I can also with you *look forward* to the time when Christ shall come with all his saints, and find the armies of Gog and Magog [or Russia] gathered against Jerusalem in the land of Judea.

That the interval between the resurrection and that coming will be occupied in part with the return of the Jews is very probable; and that the descent of Jesus at the resurrection will be the time when his *sign* will be seen by the tribes of the earth, causing them to mourn, but will soon be disregarded, as all the rest of the *signs* have been, seems also plain; and it may be that the sign of the Son of Man will be the signal for the Jews to turn towards their own land.

Your brother searching after truth.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

The views of Bro. Carver, in the foregoing letter, are the same some Literalists take, both in England and America. We think we have impartially and

without prejudice, examined that view of the resurrection of the saints, before the appearing of Christ to others, or what is called "two manifestations;" one to raise the saints and glorify them, and the other his appearance to the world afterwards; and we are compelled to regard the subject in a favorable light, though we are not settled that that is the correct view.—EDITOR.

Br. WILLIAM ONGLEY, Chemung Co., N. Y., writes:

BR. STORRS,—Praise the good Lord, we find many that are steadfast in the doctrines of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. They seem not to fear the nominal priest or people, who teach fables but not the Bible. Last Lord's day we had a blessed public meeting. After which we retired to Br. Richard House's to spread the Lord's table, to break bread and take the cup free to all that love Jesus Christ. About twenty partook with us, and two or three came out and have made a bold stand for Jesus and his truth. Brethren pray for us, and for those lambs of the flock.

We have sold many copies of your Six Sermons in these parts; to the praise of our God they have been made a great blessing. I wish you to send me some more of them. Yours, waiting for immortality and eternal life.

—

Br. N. M. CATLIN, Indiana, writes:

BR. STORRS,—Truth is advancing in these parts. There is a great demand for your works on Immortality. I think I could dispose of $10 worth per quarter, if I could raise the means to purchase, but I must do as I can, and I am glad to be able to do a little in circulating the light, for I love truth and its advocates.

Please accept the assurance of my highest regard for yourself, as a brother in Christ.

—

Br. O. H. HITCHCOCK, Arcade, N. Y., writes:

DEAR BROTHER,—Notwithstanding I cannot see just as you do upon some points, I do think there is interesting and profitable matter enough in each number of the Examiner, to richly pay for all its expense.

We truly live in a very eventful period. Signs I think there is no mistaking, that this world is ripening for destruction, and the greatest event the world ever knew is soon to take place. Judging from my observation in this part of the country, if the Savior should come now but very few would be found ready. May the perilous times in which we live caution us to cling close to the cross of Christ.

—

Br S. W. GERELDS, N. H., writes:

BR. STORRS,—I am well pleased with the Examiner as a general thing, though there are some ideas in it I cannot as yet fully understand. It appears to be our lot, in this state, to see through a glass darkly, but God has made it our duty and privilege to study his holy word. The Examiner, I am happy to say, has proved a powerful auxiliary in understanding it. The things referred to above are, the return of the Jews and probation after the advent; but I am willing to read; and if I must be in error, I would as soon have Br. Storrs' as any others. I do not recollect having seen Zech. 14th harmonized with Math. 13: 37 to 43. Will you impart light to us on those Scriptcres? Is the city of Zech. and of Rev. 20, the camp of the saints, and that of Rev. 21, which John saw come down from heaven, all one? Will the saying of Peter, 3d chapter, take place at the advent or towards the evening of the day of the Lord? A short article in answer to these inquiries will greatly oblige.

—

Br. R. L. PARTRIDGE, Ohio, writes:

BR. STORRS,—The cause of Christ is rather progressing here. Though we have had bitter persecution, and have waded through strong opposition, yet it seems as if the foundation of heathen superstition in some minds is shaken. While some acknowledge the supremacy of the advent views, as seen in Scripture light, others (fearing Diana may fall) think that the best way to get along with the "infidel doctrine," is to keep still and say as little about it as possible; among these latter are preachers.

But the brethren are industrious, and the subject of life and death is considerably agitated. One individual who has lately united with the M. E. Church during a recent revival, being in class-meeting said, if there is any reality in religion he wished to know it, (he having been trained in the popular theory of the day, and discovering its non-essentials) said that the great question with him is "If a man die shall he live again?" I thought that if it was light he wanted, I might possibly be instrumental in helping him to a new ray, clear from the horizon of scriptural abundance, and consequently handed him a copy of your Six Sermons, which he is now perusing. We have preaching occasionally by Br. Lyons, regular prayer meetings and monthly meetings.

—

Br. F. J. MANSFIELD writes from Illinois:

BR. STORRS,—We are with you, out this way, on the destruction of the wicked and the state of the dead. I know of none who believe in the soon coming of our Lord in northern Illinois, but what are with you. It seems to me if men would read without prejudice, they would see such an overwhelming amount of evidence in the case, that they would be constrained to say, It is the truth of God.

Your "Six Sermons," together with "Pinney on the Purpose of God," are doing great good. I wish it was in my power to scatter them through this western country. Many are inquiring on the subject and want light. I know of several who are now deeply interested in the subject of the advent of Christ, whose minds were called up to this subject by the *Life and Death* question. No one can bring himself to believe that Adam was threatened with hell fire when he died. No, that *fable* was invented by wicked men who made money out of purgatorial fires. The simple truth is—Had not God made provision for fallen man, he would have gone down to *death*, and would have been as though he had never been.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1849. No. 9.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW No. VIII.

"The common sentiment of mankind."

Gentle reader! I am glad, for your sake, that Mr. Lee has introduced the subject of, and based an argument on, *"the common sentiment of mankind"!*

He has proved, overwhelmingly and incontestably proved, the PAGAN ORIGIN *of the popular doctrine of immortality!* He has triumphantly sustained the very position we have long maintained, viz.: *That "the immortality of the soul" is pagan in its origin, and was generally believed among pagans.*

But, strange to say, while Mr. Lee has sustained the above point, he makes use of it for the purpose of proving the soul immortal! His argument amounts to this:

The ancient Egyptians, Persians, Phenicians, Scythians, Celts, Druids, Assyrians, &c., believed in the immortality of the soul—it was "the common sentiment" of all these nations. *Therefore*, the soul *is* immortal!

Or, to state it differently:

That which is "the common sentiment of mankind," is true;

But the immortality of the soul is "the common sentiment of mankind;"

THEREFORE, the immortality of the soul is true!

By this logic Mr. Lee's proposition stands or falls! Mr. Lee says—"If destructionists can prove that the doctrine in question had some other, or if some other sentiment can be named, manifestly false, and equally common in the world, of the origin of which no account can be given, we acknowledge they will evade the force of this argument; but until this is done the argument must prove ruinous to their theory."

1. We are called upon, by the above, to prove that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul had some other origin than the Bible. And, on this point, Mr. Lee, himself, has helped us to a considerable amount of evidence, as we before remarked; but we shall examine the question more closely than he has done. What if the Babylonians, Medes and Persians believed the soul immortal? What if Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, taught it? What if the sentiment abounds in Homer, Ovid and Virgil? Do these facts prove the doctrine all divine? If so, the prevalence of other "sentiments," held by these nations and distinguished persons, upon the same principle of reasoning, must also be divine. If Mr. Lee's logic will prove conclusive in one case, it will in another—yes! in all others! If he receive the pagan idea of immortality, he must take along with it the pre-existence of souls—the transmigration of souls—and the rejection of the resurrection of the body! He must not divide the dose, though bitter! but swallow the whole like a man!

The oldest hypotheses of the Oriental World, upon this subject, resolved themselves into the doctrine of *emanation* and *imanation;* issuing from the "*soul of the universe*" at birth, and reabsorbed at death. They regarded the soul as a part of the Deity; thus making him *divisible*, which is one of Mr. Lee's "essential properties of matter"!

DR. GOOD says—"If we turn from Persia, Egypt, and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which *it is certain* that Persia, and highly probable that Hindostan, derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject" (*of the immortality of the soul,*) "left in as blank and barren a silence, as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or, if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt, and sometimes disbelief. The tradition, indeed, of a future state of retributive justice seems to have reached the schools of this part of the world, *and to have been generally*, though perhaps not universally, accredited; BUT THE FUTURE EXISTENCE IT ALLUDES TO IS THAT OF A RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, AND NOT OF A SURVIVAL OF THE SOUL AFTER THE BODY'S DISSOLUTION"! Here, then, is an exception to Mr. Lee's universal "consent of mankind." We have one place—one country—where the popular dogma of immortal-soulism was "blank and barren;" and where the opposite view was "*generally*" believed. And we find this, too, just where we might expect to find it, *viz.: where the light of revelation shed its illuminating beams!* That country is Idumea! Here JOB, that venerable patriarchal saint, who held communion with the Living God, and not with the *Buthos* or *Demiurgus* of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Assyrians, &c.—here, I say, Job lived; and from this quarter we have, as Dr. Good expresses it, "that astonishing and transcendent composition" called "the Book of Job;" "a work," says he—although on Mr. Lee's side of the question—"that ought assuredly to raise the genius of Idumea above that of *Greece*," &c., and, may I not add, the *knowledge* of *Job* far above that of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Dr. Dick and Mr. Lee—all combined!

Dr. Good continues—"Yet in this sublime and magnificent poem, replete with *all the learning and wisdom of the age, the doctrine upon the subject before*

us is merely as I have stated it, a patriarchal or traditionary belief of a future state of retributive justice, NOT BY THE NATURAL IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, BUT BY *A RESURRECTION OF THE BODY"!*

Dr. Good makes this belief "patriarchal or traditionary;" but this is unnecessary, as Job was doubtless an inspired man. Dr. Good's testimony is the more valuable, because he believed in the popular doctrine of immortality.

Whether, therefore, the dogma of natural immortality originated with the old serpent, who said, "Ye shall not surely die;" or whether it originated in Egypt, Persia, Media, Babylonia, or elsewhere, it matters not. One thing is certain, it did not originate from God, else Job would have been in possession of it; and I will put Job's knowledge and wisdom against all the Babylonians, Persians, Medes, Assyrians, Zoroasters, and Platos on earth! Again, this is doubtless the oldest book or document extant, and on that account demands the attention of the sincere inquirer after truth on this subject.

"*The Hindoo philosophers*," says Dr. Good, "TOTALLY *and* UNIVERSALLY *denying a resurrection of the body, and supporting the doctrine* (of future existence) *alone upon the* NATURAL IMMORTALITY *of the soul, and the Arabian philosophers* (among whom was Job) *passing over the immortality of the soul, and resting it alone upon a* RESURRECTION OF THE BODY."

The Hindoo view of this question, is the legitimate tendency of the modern dogma on the same subject—*it leads to a denial of the resurrection.*

Mr. Lee, then, is welcome to his Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Assyrian, and Hindoostan associates, and their authority! He is welcome to the company of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Orpheus, Socrates, Plato, and a host of others! He is in *learned!*—but superstitious company! But, to be consistent, he should go all the way with them: he should believe in the pre-existence and pre-intelligence of the soul—that it is a part of God—that it *may suffer* in purgatory—and that it may be transmigrated!

The Grecian philosophy was imported by Pythagoras from India, whose philosophers reprobated the doctrine of a resurrection. So, when Paul preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead, in the Argora of Athens, the Athenians declared he brought strange things to their ears, and inquired what the new doctrine was.

Here, then, we have the whole subject before us. On one hand we have Mr. Lee's long array of nations, composing "the heathen world, believing in the natural immortality of the soul, with its kindred appendages. On the other hand, we have the light of truth, concerning the resurrection of the body, pouring its steady rays from the days of Job, through the dark ages, down to the present time.

And, now, I shall turn Mr. Lee's argument against him, by affirming that the "common sentiment of mankind" is wrong! *Truth* has always been in the minority, and it always will be, until the Lord comes and takes the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven! Error, in some, or all its forms, is "the common sentiment of mankind." And if Mr. Lee were to carry out his rule, he would be compelled to admit the *eternity of matter*, although he seems to have such an abhorrence of it, for his "heathen" witnesses depose to *its* truth! Let us now state this argument in form:

That which is "the common sentiment of mankind" is true;

But *error* is "the common sentiment of mankind;"

Therefore, *error* is *true!*

But why should we take "mankind" as the standard of truth? Why not take a nation? A "heathen" nation, to follow Mr. Lee's example? Why not take Europe? or one of the nations of Europe? Why not take Italy? Why not take the Pope? Why not take the most enlightened nation on earth? Will Mr. Lee submit his faith to such a standard? If he were to submit his faith to the "common sentiment" of any nation on earth, he would be weighed in the balance and found wanting. Go to the "heathen world" to learn the doctrine of immortality! Go to Babylon—to India—to Egypt—to the Eastern Magicians, Soothsayers, Astrologers and Philosophers, to learn the doctrine of eternal life? Place these in the collegiate chair, and let the venerable Job, of the land of Uz, sit at their feet, and learn? Place the wisdom of Zoroaster and his associates, which is "foolishness with God," in opposition to the spirit of wisdom divine? A man must be hard pressed for evidence to sustain his faith, when he leaves the oldest and most venerable document on earth, and seeks to the Vedas of the Brahmins and the Zendavesta of the Parsees for light on the question of immortality!

Here, then, is a fact to which we call special attention, viz.: *That the denial of the resurrection of the body was as much "the common sentiment of mankind," as the doctrine of the soul's immortality.* Among all Mr. Lee's witnesses, only one—*Zoroaster*—believed in, or taught, a resurrection. Now, I can find as many exceptions to Mr. Lee's "common consent of mankind," in relation to the immortality of the soul, as he can find on the subject of a *non-resurrection.* Will Mr. Lee give me the "*origin*" of this "sentiment?"

Mr. L. says—"If the doctrine of a future existence be an error, it is the most general one that ever entered the world," &c. Mr. Lee here makes a false issue; for it is not the "doctrine of a *future existence*" that is denied; but it is the predication "of a future existence" on the "natural immortality of the soul," instead of the resurrection of the body.

Mr. Lee says—the doctrine of the immortality of the soul "prevails most where the Scriptures are most known and read." But, alas! for Mr. Lee's cause, *his* evidence is all on the other side of the question! If he had said—that the doctrine in question "prevails most where the Scriptures are *least* known and read," he would have spoken the truth; and his statement would have harmonized with his "heathen" testimony! For surely he will not contend that the Scriptures were "most known and read" by the men and nations of whom he has spoken!

Again he says—"The doctrine must have had its origin." Of course, Mr. Lee, it had its origin; but was that origin divine? If it was, you have failed to prove it, for your witnesses are *pagan.* Taking the *non-resurrection of the body* as a sentiment running parallel with the doctrine of the soul's immortality—among the nations and tribes

referred to, I will adopt Mr. Lee's mode of reasoning, thus: As the NON-RESURRECTION OF THE BODY prevails in the heathen world, "and as no account can be given of its introduction, it follows that it must have sprung from some one of the following sources:—It must be instinct, the result of natural reason, from the light of nature, the impression of God's spirit on the mind, or the principle of revelation contained in the Bible. Now, if it be instinct, it must be from the Creator; if it be the result of natural reason, it cannot be unreasonable; if it be from the light of nature, it is a revelation from God; if it be the impression of God's spirit on the mind, it is no less a divine revelation; and if it be the sentimeut of the Bible, none but infidels will deny it"! Thus Mr. Lee's logic will work both ways! It will alike apply to every prevalent sentiment, true or false! It will apply especially to many of the appendages of the immortality of the soul. But Mr. Lee makes a bad use of his own logic; for, will he tell me what sentiment has not sprung from one or the other of the sources he has mentioned? I apprehend he will fiud that every sentiment extant proceeded from one or the other of those sources. What, then, has Mr. Lee gained by this flourish? Absolutely nothing! What is "natural reason"? If Mr. Lee mean by this *unenlightened reason*, then I affirm that it has given birth, not only to *his* favorite doctrine, but a thousand other vagaries and absurdities which revelation repudiates, and *enlightened reason scouts!*

2. Now, let us look at this subject from another point.

In perfect harmony with what we have said, concerning the origin and prevalence of the popular view, I will remark, *that before the Babylonish captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests*, the Jews observed the most profound silence upon the state of the dead. They spoke of it as a place of silence, darkness, and inactivity. This fact speaks volumes as to the "heathen" or pagan origin of the doctrine we are calling in question. They knew nothing of natural immortality till they were carried captive to Babylon, and mingled with some of Mr. Lee's witnesses!

Again, "after the Hebrews mingled with the" Babylonians, "Greeks and Romans, they insensibly slided into their use of terms, and *adopted some of their ideas on such subjects as those on which* THEIR ORACLES WERE SILENT." Hence the peculiar views of the Pharisees, many of whom not only believed in the pre-existence of souls—but, also, their immortality and transmigration. This is the reason why the question was put to our Lord, concerning the man who was born blind. They supposed it possible for the man to have sinned in a previous state, which was the cause of his being born blind. They also thought that Jesus Christ was in possession of the soul of John Baptist, or one of the prophets. Let us now sum up the whole argument:

1. We have seen that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the pre-existence of the soul, and its transmigration, together with a reprobation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, was in its origin pagan or heathenish. Mr. Lee has given us ample proof of this. I have given additional proof.

2. That in Idumea or Arabia—the country of Job, who is the author of the oldest document extant, we find the opposite doctrine prevailing; and a future life predicated on the resurrection of the body.

3. That the prevalence of a sentiment is no proof of its truth, or correctness; but, if anything, affords presumptive evidence against it. Truth has always been in the minority.

4. That previous to the Babylonish captivity, the Jews were silent on the state of the dead, regarding it as a state of silence and darkness.

5. But that *after* the Hebrews mingled with the Babylonians, Greeks and Romans, they adopted their *ideas* on such subjects as those on which their oracles—the Old Testament—was silent. (See Appendix to New Version.)

6. And that reason unenlightened, has given birth to a thousand vagaries, and among them the dogma of "natural immortality."

But, we are not done with this subject yet; we wish to place it where the hand of mortal disinterment can never reach it! And I now affirm, that revelation has placed the seal of condemnation on the oriental science, of a part of which Mr. Lee is the special advocate.

First, then, in reference to the very nations whom Mr. Lee has convoked as witnesses, Paul says—"Professing to be wise men, they became fools; for they changed the glory of the immortal God into the likeness of an image of mortal man, of fowls, of four-footed beasts, and of reptiles." This will apply to Mr. Lee's Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek and Roman witnesses. Idolatry was as current among them as the idea of the soul's immortality; so that even in Athens, at that time the most enlightened city of the oriental world, they had *thirty thousand gods*, and held the *natural immortality* of the soul; but *rejected* the resurrection of the body. In the above quotation I have not followed the common version, though I have no objection to it; but have given a better rendering of the language, which is sanctioned by Campbell and McKnight. Here is another: "For this doctrine (the preaching of Christ) is, indeed, foolishness to the destroyed; but to us, who are saved, it is the power of God. Therefore, it is written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to naught the knowledge of the prudent. Where is the wise man? Where the Scribe? Where the disputers of this world? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Again, Paul says—"The world by wisdom knew not God." The Greeks sought after wisdom—the wisdom of the Platonian school, and consequently, the preaching of life and immortality, through Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead, was "*foolishness*" to them. Paul did not teach "the wisdom of this world"—he did not speak the theological dialect of Greece and Rome. And here we are reminded of an important fact, that, although the words and ideas, concerning natural immortality, are found scattered through the works of pagan philosophers, *we have neither the one nor the other in all the revelations of God!* Why this singular *omission*, if it be the doctrine of the Bible? "O!" says Mr. Lee, "it is taken for granted." Taken for granted, indeed! This is a mere *evasion* of the argument. There is not a particle of truth in it. The Bible does not take one doctrine "*for granted*," and then *teach an opposite one!*

"The theological dialect of the oriental and occidental schools is a compound of foolish words

and phrases, which make a foolish language," the product of confusion, mythology and ignorance. They taught "a vain philosophy;" the philosophy of Greece and Rome, which Paul justly avers is "falsely so called." Hymeneus and Philetus appear to have been professors of this oriental science. What this science is, we have already seen; and I would here only remind you, that the dogma of a *translation to heaven or hell at death, is one item of that profane science by which they overthrew the faith of some in the resurrection.* It was upon this hypothesis that "some" among the Corinthians said there was "no resurrection;" and this, I repeat, is the legitimate tendency of the philosophy and theology of my friend Mr. Lee.

In concluding this long review of Mr. Lee's, No. 10, I will, without arguing them, present the legitimate tendencies of the view we are opposing. It is furnished to my hand by an intelligent living author.

1. *The dogma of "immortal souls" contravenes the Mosaic account of the Fall.*

2. *It reduces the Mosaic account to an absurdity.*

3. *It necessitates a change of the words of the Spirit from their proper to a figurative signification.*

4. *It is subversive of the resurrection and the judgment.*

5. *The pagan tradition of the soul's immortality, not only renders null and void the resurrection to life and judgment,* BUT IS EQUALLY SUBVERSIVE OF THE PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF MESSIAH ON EARTH AGAIN.

6. THE HYMENEAN GNOSIS *of immortal soul-ism, and ethereal translation at death, abrogates the reign of Messiah on David's throne for a season and a time.*

I pledge myself to make good every item in the above indictment, when it is demanded by counter-evidence. J. T. W.

THE ENGLISH DISCUSSION.

"ATHANASIA: OR, FOUR BOOKS ON IMMORTALITY. *By John Howard Hinton, A. M.*"—Such is the title of a book that we have received from England, and of which Dr. Lees, of Leeds, speaks in his letter found in the Examiner for March last. We sent for this book immediately on the receipt of Dr. Lees' letter, but it has been delayed in coming to hand. For the contents of it we refer our readers to Dr. Lees' letter above referred to. We have had time only to glance over that part of the work which relates to his remarks "*On the argument as conducted by Rev. George Storrs.*" If we *must* be converted back again into the old theory, we should like to be so by such a writer as Mr. Hinton. His *manner* is kind, christian-like, and well calculated to win our esteem and affection: we certainly feel that he has a brotherly heart, and that, to us, gives great weight to his argument. He is far removed from the narrow bigotry which characterizes most who defend the same side of the question. From the hasty examination we have been able to give his remarks on our "Six Sermons"—for that is evidently all he has seen of our writings—we are much pleased, and may probably be led to *modify* some of our *expressions*, while at the same time we are greatly strengthened in the truth of our *general position* of the sinner's final doom. On a remark of ours in Six Sermons, page 75, that men in the days of our Lord "were not looking for eternal happiness merely, or an escape from eternal misery, but *simply for eternal life*," Mr. Hinton, quoting the words which we have italicised, says: "Now the author here affixes the idea of conscious being to the word life, as its literal or primary meaning, and so insists upon it. To this I reply, that this is *not* the primary meaning of the term. Life is a word having primary reference to organized substances in which its organic functions are maintained:" p. 364. We let this definition pass for the present. And then it follows that Death is a word having primary reference to *disorganized* substances in which the organic functions are destroyed; and this, in fact, Mr. Hinton admits, for he says, p. 363: "The primary meaning of the word death is the cessation of the functions of an organized substance; and when we speak of the death of a man, we mean to denote the fact, and nothing more, that the functions of the organized substance which entered into his constitution have ceased."

This definition we will not now object to; and think in the issue it will help us greatly to fortify the *general position* of our Six Sermons. Our friend—for we truly feel that he is such—has given us a firm foot-hold; but we have neither time nor space to notice him further this month.

The foregoing was written just as the Examiner for August was going to press, and intended to to have been inserted in that number, but we were compelled to leave it out. Since that, we have had time to examine the work generally, and commence giving our readers some notes upon it in this number of the Examiner, which are designed to be continued.

NOTES ON HINTON'S "ATHANASIA."—No. I.

The first thing we notice is Mr. Hinton's definition of *immortality*. He says—"The idea conveyed by this word in relation to man is that he is *adapted* to live for ever, or that he is not liable to the cessation of conscious being from any natural cause;" pp. 8 and 9. Again, p. 72, he says—"I take the proper immortality of a creature to be his non-liability to death (here understanding the term death of a cessation of its proper being) by natural causes, or by causes proper to itself." On the same page he says of the orthodox party—"Among the evangelical dissenters of the present day I know of no evidence that they, or any considerable number of them, conceive man to be immortal in the sense that he *positively shall* live for ever.'"

We are glad to hear Mr. Hinton affirm this, and hope he is not mistaken in it; because, if true, it shows that orthodoxy, at least in England, has undergone a radical change in "*the present day*:"

for, we conclude, even Mr. H. will not and cannot deny but the popular orthodox sense of immortality *has been*, before "the present day," that all men "*positively shall* live for ever;" and if that is not *the sense* in which all the orthodox party in America use the term in the present day, except so far as they have been compelled to modify it in the controversy now going on, then we acknowledge that we ourself preached twenty years, and was in constant intercourse with ministers, without ever once hearing or suspecting but that they held the definition of immortality to be, in relation to man, that all "*positively* shall live for ever." But it seems a new era has dawned in England, and we hail it with joy, and hope it may spread its light on the pagan land this side the Atlantic. The point, in "the *present day*," in England, that they use immortality to signify that man "*positively shall* live for ever," is given up.

This is a great advance towards the truth: and as immortality, according to Mr. H. and his coadjutors, in relation to man, is only an "*adaptation* to live for ever, or a non-liability to death by natural causes, or causes proper to" himself, we may fairly conclude that man *may not live for ever* if some cause foreign to himself shall intervene to bring about his death, or to cause the "cessation of" his "proper being." This Mr. Hinton's theory will not allow him to deny: hence we think he and his coadjutors in England, if they do not stop in their search after truth, will be brought to see, that though man has an adaptation to live for ever, yet he "*positively shall*" NOT "live for ever" irrespective of moral character; and that is precisely the ground we occupy. Why is this shrinking, in England, from admitting that immortality has the sense of positive endless continuance in being? Is it not clearly because the truth, from some quarter, whether by the operations of their own minds or otherwise, has pressed upon them, that the orthodox, or popular theory, which till "the present day" has given the sense of positive, eternal, uninterrupted existence to the phrase immortality, is a ground untenable and without foundation in the revelation of God? We believe that is the fact; and the abandonment of such a position in "the present day" shows *advance*, which gives us much pleasure.

But we now proceed with Mr. Hinton's definition of immortality "in relation to man." We suppose, of course, that it is universal in its application to man. From this word, then, he cannot show that *any man*, whatever his moral character is, "*positively shall* live for ever:" all he can do from it is to show that when the righteous put on immortality by a resurrection from the dead, they put on an "*adaptation* to live for ever," or a "non-liability to death by natural causes:" that is all that can be gained from the word; they stand in the same position that Adam stood prior to his sin. That we are correct in this view of Mr. Hinton's theory, we infer from pages 89 and 90 of his work, where he says—"I speak of man antecedently to sin, and of the adaptation of his nature as a creature of God. I affirm that according to his nature man is immortal * * * * * that, but for sin, man's existence would never have ceased."

That man by creation was "*adapted*" to live for ever—that is, the circumstances in which he was created were adapted to perpetuate his existence without end, we as fully believe as Mr. Hinton. But what were those circumstances? Were they in *his nature*? They must be, if Mr. H.'s definition of immortality be correct. But we deny that such was the fact. The perpetuation of his existence depended upon the *circumstances* with which he was surrounded; and hence "lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and eat and *live for ever*" he is removed from those circumstances upon which his *continued* existence depended. This certainly does not look as though man by creation was endowed with "non-liability to death by natural causes, or causes proper to" himself. So far from it, it seems as if the natural cause of death was in himself, which could only be stayed or averted by circumstantial causes, and when he was removed from them he naturally fell back again to the dust from whence he came.

If we are correct in these views, Mr. Hinton's definition of immortality, though it may convey *his* meaning, does not convey the scripture sense; or if it does, we can derive no comfort from Paul's declaration that "this mortal shall put on immortality;" as that, according to Mr. H., necessarily implies nothing more than Adam possessed before he sinned; and hence, for all that phrase teaches, saints may after the resurrection meet with a like disaster to that of Adam, and experience another death. From the phrase *immortality*, according to Mr. Hinton, we cannot show that man "*shall positively* live for ever" after the resurrection. Where then shall we look for this assurance? Can we find it in the phrase *life*?

Mr. Hinton's Definition of the word Life.

He maintains that "Life is a word primarily used to express the active or living condition of organic substances; and it is not," he says, "in its strict or literal sense, applicable to any thing but organic substances, vegetable or animal. When applied to any other objects," he adds, "it is on the ground of some analogy or resemblance; that is, consequently, not literally, but figuratively." pp. 28, 29. Here is some truth and some error. It would be true with regard to created things if we were to amend his definition by saying—"Life is a word primarily used to express the active or living condition of *the* organic substances *of sensitive creatures, whose general condition is one of consciousness;* and it is not, in its strict or literal sense, applicable to any thing *else*." The italic words are our corrections of Mr. Hinton's definition. His definition is an *assumed* one; but the law and the testimony shall settle ours. We have no need to travel far to sustain our position; the first chapters of Genesis will suffice to give us the *primary* use of the word *life*. In the account of creation *life* is not predicated merely of the "living condition of organic substances." It is not affirmed of the *earth* after its *organism*—it is not affirmed of the *waters*, nor of the *grass*, nor of the *herb*, nor of the *fruit trees*, nor of *any of the trees* which the Lord God made: no, nor of the sun, moon, stars, or any of the lights of heaven. This fact is fatal to Mr. Hinton's theory. But it is affirmed of all the *sensitive* creatures, whose general state is that of *consciousness*. Thus—"God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that *hath life*, and fowl that may fly above the earth," &c. "And God created great whales, and every *living* creature that moveth," &c.: chap. 1: 20, 21. God said to man—"have dominion over the fish

of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every LIVING *thing that* MOVETH upon the earth:" v. 28. Again, to man, "God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat: and to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that *creepeth* upon the earth, WHEREIN THERE IS LIFE," &c. Here, we must think, is abundant evidence of the *primary* use of the word *life*: and though the trees, herbs, &c., were an "active or living condition of organic substances," the "strict or literal sense" of the word is not applied to them at all; and hence we may safely conclude it was *not* "applicable to any" of them, except "on the ground of some analogy or resemblance, that is, consequently not literally, but figuratively."

That the *primary* sense of the word life, in the Bible, is not applicable to organic substances without sensation, or without the capacity of consciousness, is further evident from the account of the flood, in which the phrase "every *living substance*" is employed, and is immediately explained to signify "both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of heaven," while nothing is said of "vegetable life," or of vegetables having life. The Lord said, "the end of all *flesh* is come before me--I will destroy *man* whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping things, and the fowls of the air—I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy *all flesh* wherein is the *breath of* LIFE—every thing that is in the earth shall *die*." The Lord then gave Noah the following direction—"Of every LIVING *thing* of *all flesh*, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them *alive* with thee: they shall be male and female—fowls—cattle—creeping thing—two of every sort—to keep them *alive*—and they went in unto Noah into the ark two and two of *all flesh* wherein is the breath of *life*"—that is, clearly, all sensitive or conscious creatures. Then it is added of those out of the ark—"*All flesh* DIED that *moved* upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing—and every man; all in whose *nostrils was the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land *died*—Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark."

Thus we see, that "*life* is a word *primarily* used to express" the "active condition of" creatures, and of those only, who have sensation, or are endowed with senses, which distinguish them from the "active condition of" mere "organic substances," or "living *vegetables*." When the word is applied to vegetable organization it is used in a figurative or *analogical* sense, not in its *primary*.

The creation of man is equally in point in proof of the position we take on this subject; but we think we do not need to press that point on Mr. Hinton's attention: he cannot fail to see that the word life in the Scriptures has its *primary* application, not merely to the "active or living condition of organic substances," but "is a word *primarily* used to express" created things whose peculiar characteristic is, in general, consciousness, or sensation. Whatever may be its definition in the schools of "philosophy," we think it clear we have the Scripture definition, as given by the Creator himself: and we cannot but think, from the general candor of Mr. Hinton in his work, that on reviewing this point he will be led to acknowledge his mistake. It is true, such an acknowledgment is fatal to his whole argument against us, which can only be maintained by saying that the term life *primarily* does not express a creature whose peculiar characteristic is, in general, *conscious existence*. If we are right in the definition we have presented, of the primary meaning of the word, Mr. Hinton cannot claim its uniform application in a *figurative* sense when spoken of the reward of the righteous. It is not, as he maintains, "a choice between two analogical significations" of the word life, but a choice between its literal, *i. e.* its *primary* sense and a figurative or analogical one. We maintain that the word *life*, in the Bible, has its primary and literal sense, generally; if there are exceptions, and we freely admit there are, it is to be shown that the text, context, or other Scriptures require the exception; and we think it not difficult to determine when that is the case. Mr. Hinton, therefore, nor any one else, is to assume that when *life* is promised and proclaimed, as it is throughout the Scriptures, that the word is used figuratively; that is, for "*happiness*." We do not admit it. We consider such a view, however undesigned in its advocates, as subversive of the very ground work of faith, and as launching us into the regions of fancy. Life is one thing, and distinct by itself; happiness is another and different matter. As, however, there could be no happiness without life, life is the first and great gospel promise and proclamation—*life*, ETERNAL LIFE. Such a life must inevitably draw after it happiness: all misery imports decay, and unless arrested must sooner or later result in the extinction of life. That point, however, we shall not argue now.

Page 95 Mr. H. says—"Since the only value of animated, or conscious existence, lies in the happiness derivable from it, life comes in some cases to denote happiness." Again he says—"Life is an expression for THE BENEFITS of Christ's death, that is for the WHOLE of them:" p. 33. In a qualified sense we may admit, that it is thus used sometimes: that is, none of all the other benefits could be possessed without life, and therefore to give eternal life is to bestow all other benefits communicated by Christ—they all follow in the train as a necessary result. But if life is by nature, and *not* one of the benefits, yea, the primary one, upon which all the others depend, then the phrase life must signify, when applied to the benefits by Christ, *happiness*, as Mr. H. contends. If so, then by a substitution of the term happiness for life we shall have the sense of the word. Mr. H. thus substitutes it in 2 Tim. 1: 1, "The promise of life in Christ Jesus;" and reads it—"The promise of happiness in Christ Jesus;" and says—"I do not see why this should not afford satisfaction in all cases in which life is used to express the benefits of Christ's death, inasmuch as these are all of the general nature of happiness, and readily conceived of as included in the term:" p. 32.

If the term life is to be understood as another phrase for happiness, in relation to benefits received by Christ, it cannot be relied upon to prove future life at all, save by *inference*: that is, its proper meaning in this relation is *happiness*, and we infer that to be happy we must be *alive*. The term, then, according to Mr. Hinton, cannot be urged as *direct* proof of future life. Then the matter stands thus--To say that man is immortal

signifies only that he has an *adaptation* to live forever, though it does not prove that he "*positively shall* live for ever." To say that God has promised us life in Christ Jesus, does not prove that we positively shall consciously exist for ever, or that we shall live at all, only by implication; it only proves that we shall be *happy:* so that neither of these phrases assure us certainly that our conscious existence shall be perpetuated without end. And if the *phrase eternal* is brought in to help out of this difficulty, it gives no relief; for that phrase has an "*analogical*" meaning as well as life; and as life is used in its analogical sense in the case before us, according to Mr. H., it is but reasonable to conclude eternal is also, and therefore signifies only while the subject to which it is applied continues; while the saint continues to be conscious he shall continue to be happy: but, for all the phrase "eternal life" proves, God may at any time blot him out of life proper, provided it only be done without *unhappiness;* and all evidence from either the phrase immortality or eternal life, that we "*positively shall* live for ever," is given up and lost, if Mr. Hinton's view is the true one.

Having virtually given up all dependance upon the phrases immortality and eternal life in proof that any one "*positively shall* live for ever," or even live at all hereafter, Mr. H. must find some other mode of argument to establish those points. Indeed, he has not only virtually given up this point, but has *plainly* done it so far as it relates to endless conscious existence being a gift of Christ. His words are—"There are no texts that teach never-ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers." p. 123. Surely, that is true, if he defines the phrases immortality and eternal life correctly. He adds—"The phrase everlasting life is unquestionably used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed; and it cannot, therefore, when so used, be understood according to a different analogy, that is, of never-ending existence:" p. 123. On the previous page he says—"The phrase, eternal life, ought to be taken for one idea—happiness." Hence we repeat it—that all dependence on this phrase to prove that the righteous "*positively shall* live for ever" is abandoned. We must keep this position in view as we proceed in our examination of Mr. Hinton's theory; and at another stage of our notes, we shall see on what ground, if any, he can establish the eternal conscious existence of men.

"BEARING THE CROSS."

Much is said, among professed Christians, about "bearing the cross;" but we fear little is understood or really practiced in this matter. Some seem to think *speaking in meeting* is the cross they must bear; and when they have done that they think little more about the cross. We apprehend that is a very small item in bearing the cross. Men are all naturally in love with this present world. To this world we must become *crucified.* Crucifixion is a *hard death;* but few persons are willing to die such a death; there is, however, no other way of entering into the kingdom of God. We must be "crucified unto the world, and the world unto" us. Most professed Christians, it is to be feared, have made a covenant with the world, not to part with it; and the tempter satisfies them if they speak in meeting some times, and give something to support the gospel, they may keep their covenant with the world: but, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2: 15.

How then are we to be separated from the love of the world, and be crucified unto it? *First*—By a believing view of the Lord Jesus Christ, who became poor—was despised of men—a man of sorrow, acquainted with grief—endured reproach—resisted temptation, though he "*suffered* being tempted"—when he was reviled, reviled not again—*murmured not,* though wounded, bruised, put to grief, and his soul made an offering for sin, scourged, spit upon, his hands and feet pierced with nails, his *soul in agony*—all this he bore, and no lisp of *impatience* ever escaped him. Would you be crucified unto the world, go learn of him: contemplate his poverty—his life—his sufferings—his resignation—his patience—his loving and forgiving spirit, till the whole mind is humbled within you: and then realize this truth—"If so be we *suffer* with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8: 17. Do you ask what it is to suffer with him? We answer—To suffer with the same meek, patient, forgiving, resigned spirit that he had. This leads us to say—

Second—If you would bear your cross and be crucified unto the world, REMEMBER, every trial of your life—whether *temporal* or *spiritual, personal* or *family,* from *friends* or *enemies, direct* or *indirect, great* or *small,* of *short continuance* or *long,* or *whatever* be the nature or character of it, is by the *appointment* or *permission* of that God who willeth not the death of the sinner, but who is seeking by all these trials to crucify you unto the world, and fit you to be glorified with His Son Jesus Christ. How shall this design of our heavenly Father be accomplished? It cannot be, unless you "*bear your cross.*" Do you ask again—What is it to bear my cross? We answer—It is to suffer all the trials of which we have spoken, *patiently.* You are not to quarrel with the *instrumentality* God may employ, nor indulge in *fretfulness* under it. If you do, you do *not* "*bear the cross.*" And though you should speak like an angel in meeting, yet if you *fret* and *complain* under any of the trials of life, by which God is seeking to crucify you unto the world, it is *hypocrisy* for you to talk about your "bearing the cross"—you are but deceiving your own soul. God has assured us, "*all things work together* for good to them that love him." Rom. 8: 28; yet, you can *murmur, fret,* and *complain* at those things which God has permitted or appointed!! Alas, *alas!* Do not dream you are ripening for the kingdom of God while this is the case. No, you are ripening for death—for perdition. Saith our Saviour—"In your PATIENCE *possess ye your souls.*" We shall learn soon, or when it is too late, that those words are words of solemn and awful import. If you indulge in murmuring, complaining, or *impatience* at any trials, insults, sufferings, or injuries, from whatever instrumentality they may come, and that spirit is *increasing* upon you, you are just as surely travelling in the road to perdition as God has said—"*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" We speak not now of one "overtaken in a fault," to which all are *liable* in the hour of temptation, but we speak of him upon whom this spirit is not *abating* but increasing—and it is increasing, except we bear our cross *daily:* for *every day* will bring some

cross, in some form. Happy the soul who is constantly looking to God for grace to bear every cross. We may pray to have the cross removed; but we may not pray for it only in submission to the will of God. "If it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not my will but thine be done." That is our *example;* and we cannot safely follow any other. "My grace is sufficient for thee," will often be the answer; and did we know *now* what we *shall know hereafter,* we should praise God for every trial and every cross we have to bear: yea, a *living faith* will praise God even now, that he does not leave us to our own way, lest we should be like the children of Israel, whose impatient murmurings were answered by giving them "flesh," but "leanness" was "sent into their souls." "*Be patient in all things:*" that is *bearing thy cross;* then, when Christ appears you shall have a CROWN.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"*He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*"—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—When our paper went to press for August, we had exhausted all our funds, and were about ten dollars in arrears. Through the generosity of a few of our friends, that is cleared off and the present number nearly paid for also; though we are two weeks behind our regular time of issue. We have not asked *donations,* but they are none the less acceptable on that account. It would, however, be more agreeable to us to receive the amount necessary to complete this volume from new subscribers. We shall put the October number to press immediately on the receipt of funds sufficient to pay for its issue. However the Examiner may be delayed in appearing, our enemies need not exult, nor our friends despair, for it is not *dead* nor *unconscious.*

LETTERS OF ENCOURAGEMENT.

FROM ELON EVERTS.

VERGENNES Vt., August 5, 1849.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:—I wish that my anxiety for your prosperity, in all the blessings of our heavenly Father commensurate with the stand you have taken on the side of truth, was transmissible. I would quickly diffuse it among the brethren, and incline them to do what is necessary to sustain you in publishing the "Examiner."

I deeply feel the necessity of such a paper, that fearlessly, independently of consequences, diffuses such a broad ray of light, while the popular mass are with all their sophistry trying to darken counsel, preaching fables and deceiving the innocent.

Dear brethren: I will ask you, as I often ask myself,—where were you, some six year ago? How came you to embrace such a clear light of revelation? Did your salaried preachers teach it to you? Did your sectarian creeds guide to your present faith? Did you, of your ownselves, dare to think of the Bible truths as you now do? Do you not often exclaim, Oh! how great was my darkness; how traditionized I was? Did you not try your utmost to prove your former theory to be the truth? Yea, did you not wish, that, Brother Storrs would keep such doctrines to himself? O! may the Lord forgive us.

Brethren, seeing what you now see, what would tempt you to wrap that old heathen fable about you again? What would induce you to have the "Examiner" stopped?

I will ask one question more. Are you willing that Brothers Storrs and Walsh, should willingly for OUR sakes, put their time, talents, reputation, living and all, upon the altar of our faith, and be sacrificed there, by suffering the opposition and prejudice of the popular religionists, and poverty and want? Their families need common comforts, as much as ours. Brethren, will you take this into candid consideration? While our brethren may feel it duty to preach the gospel, may it not be ours to sustain them? So reasons Paul.

I have repeatedly said, I would not, for $50,00 be deprived of the "Examiner." Not, that I can see everything as clear as our brethren that edit it: but, in it, we get a free disscussion on both sides, of very important bible doctrines, and by the best talents, of Europe and America, so that the honest enquirer is readily assisted to judge.

Brethren, a word to the wise is sufficient. Are there not enough, of a willing mind, to contribute a small amount each to disembarrass the "Examiner," that it may speak to our comfort, and to lead others to the truth? Oh! how great may our responsibility be.

Are there not fifty, who will give five dollars each, and as many more, who will give less, and then have more than the "poor widow?"

[Brother Everts letter contained five dollars, thus giving works as well as words.—ED. EX.]

FROM BR. "W. F. F."

PITTSBURG, August 12th, 1849.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:—I was very sorry to see by the last Examiner, a prospect of it not being continued regularly monthly, when it should be published every week, or at least once in two weeks. I trust the friends of "*truth*" have spoken out "*substantially*" before this time, and that we may be greeted by its bright beams on the 1st of next month and every month, until it shall come oftener.

A friend of mine (an Old School presbyterian)

loaned me a few weeks ago "Dick on future punishment." I had said a few words to him on the subject of the destruction of the wicked which he received as though tending toward infidelity. I read Dick, and returned it to him with Dobney: he read Dobney and is reading it again, and says he can scarcely believe his own senses, that his eyes have been so long closed to that truth—that there shall be "NO PLACE" found for the wicked after their judgment: that they shall be "*burned up root and branch;*" nothing of them left—be as a thing that "*was*" and "*is not*;" HE can love his God better, and see a glory in his justice and holiness which before he could not see. I enclose you a trifle [$2.00 ED. EX.] to support the Examiner and only regret that it is not in my power to do more.

FROM BR. WM. P. LEMMON.

BALTIMORE, August 15th, 1849.

BROTHER STORRS:—I note with regret your want of means to carry on the Examiner, as stated in the last number, and hope the friends of truth will sustain you as they ought. I don't agree with you in all you write, but I think the spirit of candor and kindness that characterises the Bible Examiner, is eminently fitted to correct your errors or mine, as the case may be; and, moreover, I think your paper is intrinsically worth double, at least, what you receive for it; I hope, therefore, that many, if not all your subscribers will agree, not only to double their subscriptions for the *coming year* but for the *present*, say one dollar in lieu of fifty cents per annum. Enclosed I hand you ten dollars with my best wishes for the truth's sake.

FROM BR. HENRY E. CARVER.

CINCINNATI, *Aug. 23d*, 1849.

BRO. STORRS,—Some of your friends here were pained to observe by the August number of the "Examiner" that you had become embarrassed in your efforts to disseminate *light* by want of funds to pay the printer.

Now for one I have been conscious for some time past that the price of the paper, *as it is*, is too low, and am willing to pay the advanced price, even with no alteration in the issue. It would be a source of much regret to me to see the Examiner discontinued; for I regard it as the medium of communicating to the world one of the most important, grand and glorious truths ever presented to the mind of man.

The enclosed five dollars is hereby sent by Bro. Royce, Bro. Wibel, and myself. In return, you will please send three copies of "Dobney." The balance of the money you will consider a free-will offering to aid in finishing the present volume. We consider that we have received full benefit for all we have invested in such a paper as the "*Examiner.*"

Your brother in hope of Immortality.

FROM BR. A. A. JAYNE.

NEW YORK, *Aug. 20th*, 1849.

BROTHER STORRS,—On opening the Examiner, I learned that, for want of funds, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to issue the paper for the balance of the year. I at once determined to cast my vote for its continuance; and for this purpose I enclose five dollars. If the following numbers of the paper are never issued, I shall not feel that you are indebted to me (or to any of your subscribers) one farthing; for the light which you have been instrumental in shedding upon my mind, on many disputed doctrines of the Bible, is abundantly more precious than the small sacrifice I have made in obtaining it. I read the paper for August with great satisfaction. I think almost every unprejudiced mind would accord to Bro. Walsh the best of the argument, even if they hesitated to admit that he stands firmest upon the rock of truth. The article upon the "Signs of the Times" deeply interested me. I trust you will be enabled to send the following Nos. in due season.

Yours, looking for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, only through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

BACK NUMBERS.—We can furnish the Bible Examiner to any who wish, from January, 1848, but no further back. We cannot break volumes, except to supply subscribers who have failed to receive their papers. Any such we will supply if they will give us notice of the number or numbers missing. As we shall make no charge for supplying missing numbers to subscribers, they will send us word free of postage.

DEFINITE TIME OF THE ADVENT.—If the author of an article on this topic, recently sent us, will read our editorial remarks on that subject, in the Examiner for June, he will see our reasons for not publishing his *calculation*. We cannot give currency to views on that subject which we are sure will result in no good, and can only add to the number of disappointments calculated to shake confidence in the reality of the advent itself; which we believe to be a glorious truth, and an event nigh at hand. Blessed is the man that watcheth and keepeth himself unspotted from the world, "for in such an hour as *ye think not* the Son of Man cometh."

FALLEN ASLEEP.—Sister Sarah Blynn, daughter of Br. James Blynn, of this city, fell asleep in Jesus, July 18, aged 25. For nine years, she endured the

most intense suffering from a spine affection. Her spasms were almost unremitted. In '44 and '45, she had a temporary relief, and was enabled to walk a little by the aid of crutches. We felt to praise God for this truly wonderful mercy; but it was of short continuance. Her sufferings since have been indescribable. For near three months before her death, she was unable to speak at all, or scarcely to be moved; and, though sensible, did not open her eyes. From the first year of her sickness to the last hour of life she was never known to murmur or complain; nor did she in any way manifest impatience. She was a firm believer in the second advent of Christ, of eternal life through him by a resurrection from the dead, and of the non-immortality of the wicked. A few moments before she fell asleep in death, she opened her eyes, and with a smile on her countenance, seemed to say *farewell* to her father and mother, who had watched by her bed side day and night. Unable to utter a word, she could only by signs say: "all is well." Then she fell asleep without a struggle or a sigh, and in glorious hope of a "resurrection at the last day." We might add more, but our limits forbid. We have said this much in praise of that grace which sustained her to the last, and for the information of the many christian friends and ministers who have seen and visited her during her long sickness. She *rests* from her sufferings, and will soon, we trust, enter into *life eternal* according to her faith.

EDITORIAL GENEROSITY.

The following communication, with the "Editorial Notes," we copy from the "True Wesleyan," of August 18th. We thank Br. Lee for his "editorial courtesy," and are glad to find that he "always calculates to be a little more generous than some of" his "neighbors." We will assure him, however, that he shall not outdo *us* in that respect; and we will be most happy to receive a like letter from him at any time, in answer to inquiries, and it shall find place in the Examiner, if we are so fortunate as to be able to continue our paper, which we feared we should not at the time we wrote the following letter to Br. Lee; this fact is our apology, if we need one, for sending our answer to him. That's not all; we will beat him in "generosity" if he will send us an answer to our inquiries to his article "No. II." on Immortality, in the Examiner for May last. We will exceed him in generosity by letting him finish his article without interrupting him by filling it with notes: we will say all we have to say after he has done speaking. We do not complain that Br. Lee placed his figures from "1" to "12" *in* our article, thereby interrupting us; if that is his taste he has a right to it; we practiced in that way once ourselves till we came to the conclusion that it was *bad* taste, to say nothing more. Try the principle in a public oral debate and see who would tolerate it. We say again, we will exceed Br. Lee in generosity, at least in this respect, if he will try us with a reply to our queries in the Examiner for May. And we claim that we have already exceeded him in generosity, for we have copied two of his articles, *entire*, from the True Wesleyan, on Immortality, while he has copied none of the articles from the Examiner in reply to his, nor *noticed* that any replies were being made to him by our Associate Editor.

Br. Lee, it will be seen, finishes his *notes* on our letter "by repeating the questions which," he says, "we insist have not been answered." We are perfectly willing, the readers of the Wesleyan and Examiner should judge whether we have answered the questions or not; and there we shall leave that point after a few words at the close.

"ANNIHILATION—DEATH."

BRO. LEE:—Under the above head, in the Wesleyan of the 4th instant, you have noticed some remarks of mine, relating to my objection to the use of the term "annihilation" in the immortality discussion. You conclude with the following questions: "Will Brother Storrs tell us, what he understands by the word death, and by the word annihilation, and what, in his view, is the difference between them."

By this inquiry, I presume you wish me to give my answer through the Wesleyan, which I will cheerfully do. (1.)

In your article, to which this is a reply, you said —"we mean by annihilation, what is expressed by the words, 'cease to exist,' or 'a state of non-existence:'" and you inquire—"Does Mr. Storrs mean the same thing by death?"

My answer to this inquiry, turns on what definition you give to the term "exist." (2.) For it seems that you, as well as others, have your own definition of terms. (3.) Mr. Hinton, an English writer on the same side of the immortality question with yourself, in a late mighty effort against the view I advocate, says that "death involves no cessation of existence either body or soul;" p. 449. (4.) It is manifest, however, that the "body" becomes entirely unconscious: (5.) that is "death" when the term is used in relation to the cessation of the life of sensitive beings; but it is not "annihilation:" for, as Mr. Hinton affirms, it "involves no cessation of existence" of the "body." (6.) It is for you, Mr. Hinton, and others, on your side of the question to prove that a man only half dies. (7.) I agree with Mr. Hinton, that in man's death there is "no cessation of existence in either body or soul:" [using the term soul in your sense, of a distinct entity, without adopting that sense;] (8.) Hence, your question is answered, according to the language you employ in defining what you mean by annihilation, viz.—"ceasing to exist, or a state of non-existence:" neither body nor soul "cease to exist" either in the first or second death: (9.) and it is perfectly in "the power of God" to call them up to conscious existence after the first or second death, if he will: the only difference in this respect is, God wills to call all men back from the first

death, but he wills not to call any back from "the second death;" yet neither the bodies nor the souls of the wicked "cease to exist" in the second death: but they do sink into a state of eternal unconsciousness by the will of God. (10.) But, be it remembered, not beyond His power to awaken them if he chose—such a state would be "annihilation"—their living again all turns on His will. Lest you should think I have given you a new definition in answering your questions, I beg to be permitted to give the following remarks, which I published in the Bible Examiner, June, 1844; and they may close what I have to say to you in reply at this time:

"The term annihilation, as usually understood by common people, means an absolute reducing to nothing. Now, in that sense I am no believer in annihilation, and I never use that term in speaking of the end of the wicked. (11.) I think there is a clear "distinction" between total unconsciousness and annihilation. It is evident to all, that the body is totally unconscious at the first death; but, it is very far from being annihilated. It returns to, and mingles with its mother earth. In the second death the entire man is reduced to his original elements, whatever they were; but the elements to which he is reduced are not annihilated; and God could call him back to consciousness again if he chose. Hence I reject the term, because it makes a false impression. I maintain that when the second death takes place there is a final and eternal unconsciousness of the wicked; or as it is expressed in the 37th Psalm, 20th v.—"The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume: into smoke, shall they consume away." Call that 'annihilation' if you will; I reject the term in this controversy. It has nothing to do with it." (12.)

Yours in hope of eternal life, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, GEORGE STORRS.

Philadelphia, August 6th, 1849.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

(1.) It may have been a very natural and very modest presumption, but still we intended no such thing. The article was not written for our columns. Bro. Storrs wrote about us in his own paper, and we replied in ours, and asked of him an explanation, which we supposed he would give through the same medium through which he had made the attack upon us. Had not Bro. Storrs been an editor, and had we called on him for an explanation, we should have expected to have loaned him the use of our columns, but as he commenced the attack upon us in his own columns, we supposed it most reasonable to look for the explanation to reach us through the same source, as we specified no other channel. The view Bro. Storrs takes of the subject is this: when one editor attacks another, and the assailed party replies and asks an explanation, he invites his assailant to overlook his own columns, and occupy his whom he assailed. We have not so learned editorial courtesy. Nevertheless, we publish the article, as we always calculate to be a little more generous than some of our neighbors.

(2.) Bro. Storrs knows what definition we put upon the word exist, when we speak of the human mind; there was no occasion for his creating fog where there is none, For a soul to cease to exist, is to cease to be a soul.—With us to cease to think is to cease to be a soul, for we know little about the human soul, more than what we gather from its thinking operations; with us a thought is the mind thinking, and this Bro. Storrs knows, if he has read what he found fault with. A body ceases to exist when it ceases to be a body—when it ceases to be an organism. Throw a human body into the fire and consume it, and the organism ceases to exist, but there will be the ashes left, and the fluid will exist some where, but they are not the body or the organism. But in relation to the soul, whose very existence is thought, which is never known to exist only in connection with thought, and is known to exist only from its thoughts, we know nothing of the ashes or vapor left when it ceases to be a soul, or ceases to think.

(3.) We always use terms in their commonly received sense, unless we give notice to the contrary. We introduced the word annihilation into our articles on the immortality of the soul, with such explanations as preclude almost the possibility of being misunderstood, and what we asked of Bro. Storrs was, to give a like explanation of the sense in which he uses the word death. Had he been disposed to give a frank answer, he could have so answered as not to had his meaning depend upon our definition of words, but upon his own definitions, which he might have appended.

(4.) We did not ask Bro. S. what Mr. Hinton believes concerning death, but what he, Rev. George Storrs, believes; why could he not have answered? We are not responsible for Mr. Hinton's views, nor do we hold Bro. Storrs responsible for them, but only for his own, if we shall succeed in finding out what they are.

(5.) This implies that the body is conscious, for unless it be conscious, how can it become "unconscious?" This is new doctrine; we maintain that consciousness does not pertain to the body. The body is never conscious, and Bro. Storrs is the first philosopher we ever heard talk about the consciousness of the body. Consciousness is purely an operation of the mind.

(6.) We differ from Mr. Hinton and Mr. Storrs both. When we speak of the human body, we speak of it as an organism, and when it is decomposed, we maintain that the body, the organism ceases to exist. The solid part may be blown about by the wind, and the fluid may ascend in vapor and fall in dew, or be lost in the ocean of waters, but we deny that these are the body, a human body; the body has ceased to exist, the organism is annihilated, though the elements of which it was composed may exist somewhere in wide nature.

(7.) We did not ask Mr. Hinton to prove anything; we only asked Mr. Storrs what in his opinion is the difference between annihilation and death, and our readers will not fail to see how he talks about Mr. Hinton to get rid of answering.

(8.) We did not wish Bro. Storrs to answer on the ground of our understanding of the soul, "without adopting that sense," but we wished him to answer in view of his own understanding of the soul.

(9.) For the soul to exist in our sense of the soul, is to be conscious, for with us the soul is a living consciousness, and when it ceases to be conscious, it will cease to be a soul. Bro. Storrs believes the soul dies, and yet continues to be a soul if we understand him.—Do the souls of Adam and Abel still exist? and are they human souls still? and have they maintained a distinct existence separate from all other souls that have existed since? We would like to have Bro. Storrs answer this, yea or nay. He claims to have answered our question, but we do not consider it an answer, but an evasion.

(10.) What does Bro. Storrs understand by the soul of a man? What is it? Is it a spirit, breath, life, bone, flesh, blood, solid or fluid? If it be life, as some affirm, does life die, and still exist after it is dead, so that there is such a thing as dead life? These are queries which his pretended answer naturally suggests.

(11.) Bro. Storrs knew that we did not use the term in this sense, when he complained of us for employing it. If a soul "sink into a state of eternal unconscious-

ness," it will be annihilated in the sense in which every one must know we used the term, who has read our articles.—Why then did he complain of us?

(12.) This whole extract is a mere declamation, and proves no part of any answer to our questions. If Bro. Storrs really thinks it proves his point by the text which says, "into smoke shall they consume away," he must understand it literally. If so, human souls are converted into smoke, and still they are souls in the shape of smoke. When the smoke settles down in our annual Indian summer, who can say that it is not the return of the souls of martyrs, according to this theory. We have no more idea that the text literally describes the end of human souls, than we believe the end of God's people is literally described, when it is said, "they eat up my people as they eat bread."

We close our remarks by repeating the questions, which we insist have not been answered. They are as follows: "Will Bro. Storrs tell us what he understands by the word death, and by the word annihilation, and what, in his view, is the difference between them."

The question is, "what is his opinion," &c." No matter what other people believe; they will take care of their own opinions.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Br. Lee, in his note "2" says—"With us to cease to think is to cease to be a soul, for we know little about the human soul, more than what we gather from its thinking operations; with us a thought is the mind thinking," &c.

Men "cease to think" when sound asleep: then the soul "ceases to be a soul." Men have been in a state of total insensibility for days, months, and, in some instances, for years; for these periods, longer or shorter, according to Br. Lee, the soul "ceases to be a soul." Suppose then this "ceasing to think" should last from the death of Abel to the resurrection at the last day; of course, as Br. L. will have it, the soul has "ceased to be a soul;" but the *power* of God has not "*ceased*" to be omnipotent; and he can as easily revive the soul in the last case as those previously noticed. "With us," says Br. Lee, "a thought is the mind thinking." But in each of the foregoing cases there is no "thinking;" *then* Br. Lee "knows little about the human soul," as it has no "*thinking operations*." He has said in his articles on immortality, that "the soul is a simple essence, immaterial, uncompounded and indivisible:" that seemed to imply that he knew a *great deal* "about" it; but now he "knows little about" it "more than what" he "gathers from its thinking operations." There are times when it does *not think*, and we judge that Br. Lee is now approaching the truth, *viz.*, that theologians, on his side of the question "*know little about the human soul:*" the soul, according to them, is, after all, only *thought*: a glorious soul indeed; and it "ceases to be a soul" generally, once in every twenty-four hours. Br. Lee says expressly, in note "2," "the soul, whose *very existence* IS THOUGHT;" and he adds—"which is never known to exist only in *connection with thought*, and is known to exist *only* from *its thoughts*." We will not call this "creating fog," for we think foggy as it is, it is pretty *clear*: THE SOUL IS THOUGHT, according to this definition. We are almost ready to say *Amen*. Perhaps Br. Lee would accept it as an answer to his inquiries in note "10." But he says, note "9," "For the soul to exist in our sense of the soul, is to be conscious, for with us the soul is a living consciousness, and when it ceases to be conscious it will cease to be a soul." Br. Lee has, doubtless, seen persons perfectly unconscious under the influence of chloroform, and their "thought" ceased; hence, according to him, the soul "ceased to be a soul:" there was not a "living consciousness:" cut and mangle the body as you would, there was no consciousness; and the lack of consciousness was not in the *body*, for Br. Lee says, note "5"—"Consciousness does not pertain to the body. The body," he adds, "is never conscious;" and concludes by affirming, "Consciousness is purely an operation of the mind." This authority, of course, is good in this argument. The matter then stands thus:—

"*When the soul ceases to be conscious it will cease to be a soul:*"—

But the soul ceases to be conscious by the use of chloroform:—

THEREFORE *it then "ceases to be a soul."*

But again, note "2," Br. Lee says—"For a soul to cease to exist, is to cease to be a soul." Suppose we put this together with the foregoing, thus:

To cease to exist is to cease to be a soul:—

But, under the influence of chloroform the soul ceases to be a soul, inasmuch as it "ceases to be conscious:"—

THEREFORE, *it "ceases to exist" at such times.*

In regard to Br. Lee's affirmation, at the close of his "notes," that his "questions have not been answered," we will put our answer together as may be found in our letter. It is as follows:—

"Death involves no cessation of existence in either body or soul; it is manifest, however, that the *body* becomes entirely *unconscious:* THAT is *death*, where the term is used in relation to the cessation of the *life* of sensitive beings, but it is not annihilation: it involves no cessation of existence of the body: it is for you to prove that a man only *half* dies. Neither body nor soul cease to exist either in the first or second death: and it is perfectly in the power of God to call them up to *conscious* existence after the first or second death if he will. God *wills* to call all men back from the *first* death, but he wills *not* to call any back from the *second death*—they sink into a state of eternal* *unconsciousness* by the *will* of God. But not beyond his *power* to awaken them if he chose—such a state would be annihilation."

The reader can now judge whether we did not answer Br. Lee's questions distinctly. We think we clearly stated what we understood by death, what by annihilation, and the difference between them; and if Br. Lee had not put "(5.)" in our mouth before we were suffered to finish the sentence, it seems to us he must have seen, and his readers too, that we did expressly answer his *first* question, *viz.*: "What do you understand by the word death?" In our letter, which we sent him, our words were made emphatic as in the quotation above; but he chose to remove the emphasis: of that we do not complain, for the reader would not have been likely to stumble without it, if the "(5.)" had not called off his attention before we finished the sentence, so that after reading the "note" he would not be likely to observe our reference in the expression "THAT is *death*," &c.; especially as the emphasis was removed from it.

*Not "*external*," as erroneously printed in the True Wesleyan.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

No. II.

We expressed the opinion, in our previous article, that the scarlet colored beast, Rev. 17th, is a symbol of the Papal civil power just prior to its final destruction; or, the last form of that power; and that which it took after it recovered from the "deadly wound" received, by which it was sent into the bottomless pit for a time. Having ascended out of that condition, it is presented in the 17th chap., under the seventh vial, just as the judgment is to be executed upon its rider, or the power that had managed it. The rider of this beast is described as a corrupt woman, distinctly named, "BABYLON THE GREAT," &c., and marked as a power that had shed the blood of the saints, and martyred the followers of Jesus. She is described, at verse 18, as being "that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." It is manifest, however, that the walls, streets, bricks, and mortar which go to make up a city, never reigned over any body. When it is said, therefore, that the woman is that great city that reigneth over the kings of the earth, it is clear the meaning is, the power symbolized by this corrupt woman has its seat in that great city, or in Rome. This power is, mystically, *Babylon;* and takes its name from Babylon of the Old Testament. In order fully to understand this prophecy, we must compare it with the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning Babylon.

Here we wish to state a principle which we believe will be found true of many of the prophecies of the previous dispensation. It is this—That those prophecies frequently embrace events which in their fulfilment are at a distance from each other; or, a part of the prophecy has its accomplishment in events near, and another part at a more distant period; perhaps centuries after. Or, we would distinguish them thus—*near* and *remote* events, yet combined in one prophecy without, perhaps, any notice of this distinction; leaving the developments to settle that point. None can doubt but this is the case in those prophecies relating to Messiah's sufferings and reign, or the first and second advents. Nor had the Jews, or Disciples, at first, any idea that Messiah must have *two* advents to accomplish all that was written of him. It is easy to illustrate this point by several prophecies which have had a partial fulfilment, but we do not deem it necessary now to go into the evidence further.

In examining the prophecy concerning Babylon in Rev., we shall need constantly to refer to the prophecies of Babylon in the Old Testament, which will be found to contain parts which either never have had a fulfilment at all, or only a partial one, and that mainly as a "figure of that which was to come." If this fact is kept before our minds it will help us much in understanding Revelation.

We will, before going on directly, make a more minute enquiry as to what power is symbolized by Babylon, designated as a corrupt woman. We begin with Rev. chap. 17: 1. It is there called "the great *whore*." The original word is, *pornees*, which signifies one that prostitutes herself for gain, —an idolatress—*figuratively*, a corrupt and idolatrous church. It is used frequently in the Old Testament in reference to the departures of the Jewish church from God, her husband, by her idolatries. The very first idea, therefore, in the Revelation, is that of a corrupt and idolatrous church, prostituting herself for gain; a "*great*" church worshipping idols, and multiplying gods, for the sake of gaining money and power. Again, in verse 5, she is called "*the mother of harlots.*" She is therefore the *chief* church—"the great" church. There is but one such church to be found on the earth; and it seems almost useless to argue the case. No church can answer to the description except the "*Roman* Catholic Church." She has multiplied gods, from the virgin Mary down through the whole catalogue of real and imaginary saints, and worshipped them, or prayed to them who are dead, and "know not anything;" and hence is just as guilty of *idolatry* as if she had done homage to wood or stone. She has also multiplied "*images*" innumerable, and thus shows herself the prostitute church designated "the great whore." She is indeed "*the mother church*"—but she is "the mother of *harlots*"—*pornon*—unchaste females, prostituting themselves and the gospel for gain. It is not difficult to see who are the daughters. If you see money-loving churches, conforming to the world for gain or popularity, you cannot fail to know they are of the mother of harlots. But our object being now to speak of the "judgment of the *great* whore," or *mother*, we shall not, at present, dwell upon her daughters. She is first described as a corrupt woman—then as the mother of other corrupt women—then riding and managing a corrupt civil power, symbolized by a scarlet colored beast, full of the names of blasphemy, with which she is in union. Next she is shown as a bloody persecutor; drunken—intoxicated with the blood of saints, &c. She is then presented as conducting herself in such manner, when God's words are about to be fulfilled upon her in judgment, that she is hated by the horns, or civil powers who had given their strength and power to the beast with which she was in league, and which had "carried her," (verse 7,) and they "eat her flesh and burn her with fire;" i. e. destroy her. The 18th chapter gives a detailed account of the judgment upon her, the reasons for it, some of the means by which it is inflicted, and the feelings of those interested in her continuance, and who had enriched themselves by her. All this is done under the symbol of a great and prosperous city suddenly destroyed, and the consternation and terror of such an event. A great part of the scenery here is drapery, thrown in to heighten the effect of the picture, but not to be understood as literally taking place; we speak of that part particularly from the 9th verse onward, which describes the *feelings* and *sayings* of those in the interest of this corrupt church, or Babylon.

In the 17th chapter, John was shown the beast, that this woman rode, in such circumstances as called for the "*intervention*" of the "power" of the horns, or governments, that were under the *woman* power, or ecclesiastical influence of this corrupt church. It was the woman that "reigneth over the kings" or governments "of the earth," or old Roman Empire, that invoked those governments to interfere to sustain the scarlet colored beast, or civil government the woman had ridden and controlled, and which had "carried" her in all her bloody course. After noticing that "intervention," by which the horns "agreed and gave their power and strength to the beast," it is said, "these shall make war upon the Lamb," &c., thus

intimating that this combination with the beast, at the bidding of the woman, was to constitute one of those agencies that should be specially engaged in "the battle of the great day of God Almighty." Having thrown out this hint, at verse 14, the prophecy, before proceeding directly to an account of the battle, stops to take a particular notice of the judgment on the woman, or Babylon, which is briefly noted, verse 16, but given in detail, chapter 18; though that chapter, chronologically, we think, synchronizes with the 20th verse of the 19th chap.; but being an event of such vast importance, a particular description is given of it by itself, and of the rejoicing at its fall, before arriving at the general account at the close of chap. 19. Here also we may as well remark, we think in the order of events the narrative, Rev. 19: 1—10, of the rejoicing at Babylon's destruction, follows Rev. 20: 3, and forms the introduction to Rev. 20: 4, and onward.

We are now prepared to proceed to notice the particular account of the judgment on Babylon. It is introduced as a special and separate *scene*, and therefore an angel is represented to come down from heaven, to open it and declare the reasons for this terrible judgment. He first announces that Babylon is fallen—*epesen*—one sense of the Greek word is, *to fall in judgment*. She had been tried and condemned, and the sentence is now about to be executed. This judgment is righteous, or just; she has "become a habitation"—a place of, a dwelling of—devils—*daimonon*—deities, idols, or "knowing ones;" the character of whom is next spoken of, viz. "*foul spirit*"—*pneumatos*—"foul" tempers, dispositions, feelings, affections, inclinations; all these were the result of her idolatries; as the worship and sincere service of the true God is productive of *holy* tempers, dispositions, feelings, affections, and inclinations, so Babylon's worship of images, dead saints, &c., had made her "a hold"—*phulake*—a den "of every foul," impure temper, disposition, &c.; "and a cage of every unclean and hateful," detestable, loathsome "bird"—birds that feed on carrion, putrid flesh. What a description! But answering exactly to Roman Catholic christendom. We preached on this subject a few weeks ago in this city; a secular paper here, without any knowledge of what we had said, had an article the next morning on "THE CURSES OF EUROPE," in which it said, "Most of Europe, especially the Catholic portion, is demoralized. Jesuitism, Fourierism, fanaticism of all kinds, have made it a moral chaos . . . distracted by extremes, either of superstition or infidelity, despotism or anarchy." It added, speaking of the various causes—"All, operating together, have converted all Europe into Pandemonium. This Greek word signifies *All the Devils*, or *The Place of all the Devils*." When we read this, we were half inclined to think the editor of that paper had been listening to our sermon the day previous; or at least been looking at the prophecy; but the former we presume he never does, and the latter we think not often, for he is still dreaming of the *ultimate* triumph of republicanism in Europe. Even politicians can see that "Catholic Europe" is the "*Place of all Devils*," but they do not see its doom.

A further reason announced by the angel for the judgment to be executed on Babylon is—"For all nations have drank of the wine of the wrath of her fornication"—she has spread her corrupt and idolatrous religion every where; and hence if she is not soon destroyed she will make "all nations" as corrupt as "Catholic Europe." "And the kings of the earth"—*tees gees—the land, i. e.* where she holds sway, or the old Roman empire, otherwise, "Catholic Europe"—"have committed fornication with her"—have joined in her idolatries and sought her protection; thus casting off reliance upon God, and becoming as black in idolatry as herself; hence we shall find in the sequel, chap. 19: 19—21, that they are destroyed with her, though the description of her fate is separately and at large presented in this 18th chapter; we shall find, however, that those countries that have been under her power will be prominent actors in her destruction, as represented chap. 17: 16, which work they will do in "the battle" as set forth chap. 19: 20, corresponding with chap. 17: 16, those two verses synchronizing together.

We may as well say, in this place, that we regard "the battle of the great day of God Almighty" as *now going on;* and as having commenced with the seventh vial of the seven last plagues, which we think began either with the French revolution of 1848, or within a few years previous to that time. That battle is made up of a *series of events*, passing over several years; we pretend not to say how many—time will reveal that. We are not to look for that battle in one event, but in a protracted conflict, made up of various events, or conflicts both of principles and of physical force, which we cannot doubt are now in progress. The scenery of that battle in chap. 19 we regard as all symbolical; and have no idea that "the kings of the earth, the beast, and the false prophet," &c., in that battle are to see Christ or his army, or will know that they are fighting against him, any more than the Jews knew they were "crucifying the Lord of glory." But let us not be mistaken in these remarks; we do believe that battle is to be followed with the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, and the *personal* reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, with his dominion over all the earth.

Let us not then be bewildering our minds about a battle *literally* to correspond with the symbolical representation in Rev. 19. As we presume no one supposes that a *literal* "sword out of Christ's mouth" is to be employed in that battle, so let us not blind our eyes to the truth—solemn, awful truth—that we are now actually living in the time when that battle has begun, even "*the battle of* THAT GREAT DAY *of God Almighty*," which is to close up *this age*, and bring in *the age of Messiah's personal reign*. But the children of God who expect that reign may have need of patience; for most likely it will be several years before the battle will terminate; for aught we can tell, however, God may take up his saints to meet Christ "in the air" *before* the battle is over; we are inclined to the opinion that he will, yet we have no positive assurance of it. If not so, then there may be several years of trial still awaiting them here; and they will need to heed their Lord's admonition—"*In your patience possess ye your souls.*"

We shall say more of the battle, chap. 19, when we come to explain that part of the prophecy: and give our reasons for the suggestion we have thrown out, that the armies and powers engaged in it, opposed to Christ, will be ignorant of what they are doing.

The next thing we notice in the account of Baby-

lon's destruction is the cry—"Come out of her, my people, that ye receive not of her plagues." We remark, in the first place, that Babylon has *territory* as well as power and seat. It is therefore to be surveyed as a whole; the judgment falls on her and on those occupying the territory over which she has held ecclesiastical sway, as all together go to make up Babylon. The people here called to come out of her reside on the territory under her sway, but are not as a body of her religion—they are clearly a distinct people, though some of them, from various causes, may have been ecclesiastically connected with her. Again we remark, it is a people that have been oppressed by her, and suffered severely from her; for they are directed to "reward her even as she rewarded" them, &c., verse 6. To find out who are this people, we must have reference to the unfulfilled part of the prophecy concerning Babylon in the Old Testament; or those prophecies that had only a partial accomplishment in events relating to Babylon in Chaldea. "For I srael hath not been forsaken, nor JUDAH of his God, of the LORD of hosts; *though* their land *was* filled with sin against the Holy One of Israel. FLEE OUT OF THE MIDST OF BABYLON and deliver every man his soul; be not cut off in her iniquity; for this is the time of the Lord's vengeance; he will render unto her a recompense." Jer. 51: 5, 6. The facts here presented, and the exhortation given do not correspond with the facts of the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, nor with any events prior to the Christian era. This truth is so obvious that it does seem really unnecessary to spend time to prove it. The most that could be claimed with any show of truth is, that there was a *partial* fulfilment. But the first proclamation in favor of the Jews, at that time, was by Cyrus king of Persia; and they left the seat of their captivity not to escape judgment *coming* on Babylon, or to escape her plagues. Here then is a part of the prophecy that is to be carried forward for its *full* accomplishment to the time of the New Testament Babylon, or the Babylon of Rev. 18. Again, Jer. 51: 41—45, it is said—"How is Sheshack [a *mystic* name for Babylon] taken! and how is the praise of the whole earth surprised! how is Babylon become an astonishment among the nations! the sea is come up upon Babylon; she is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof:" [that is, with the waters where the whore sitteth," which "are peoples, multitudes, nations and tongues"] . . "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." Here is an exact correspondence with the language, Rev. 18: 4, and which had no correspondence in any facts relating to the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon of Chaldea. We cannot but think, therefore, that the people called out of Babylon, Rev. 18, is that people so long oppressed and crushed by the idolatrous Mother of Harlots who has heaped upon the offspring of JUDAH such untold wrongs and sufferings. We are the more inclined to this view from the prophecy of Isa. 51, where we have the following language—"Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury; thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrung them out. . . . Thus saith thy Lord, the LORD and thy God that pleadeth the cause of his people, *Behold, I have taken out of thy* HAND *the cup of trembling*, even the dregs of the cup of my fury; *thou shalt* NO MORE *drink of it* AGAIN; but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee," &c., verse 17—23. That this prophecy relates to the posterity of Jacob none, surely, ought to deny; and it shows that a time should come after a long season of cruel oppression when the hand that had crushed them should be taken off, and the cup should NO MORE AGAIN be put to their lips, but their oppressors shall drink it. What do we see in these days? The Catholic nations of Europe have been and are removing their hands from off this long oppressed people, and at the same time judgments fall thick and fast on those nations; indicating that the hour of Mystical Babylon's judgment has come; and that the people so long oppressed by her are called by the "*voice*" of Providence "from heaven" to "come out of her; that ye receive not of *her* plagues." Before leaving the territory and dominion of mystic Babylon, however, they will try to sustain the Catholic nations where they reside, denominated by Jeremiah an effort to "*heal*" her; but this effort will prove abortive. It is thus expressed by the prophet, Jer. 51: 8, 9, "Take balm for her pain, if so be she may be healed. We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed;" which effort being unsuccessful, it is added—"forsake her, and let us go every one into his own country, for *her judgment* reacheth unto heaven," &c. At this very hour the Jews are trying to heal the Catholic nations of Europe, or to prevent their utter ruin, by fighting in her battles, and loaning large sums of money to the governments to save them from bankruptcy and ruin. True, all this may be but a selfish principle in them, that they may save the millions of dollars before loaned to those governments, and which must probably be a total loss if those governments crumble to pieces. Hence the effort to heal Babylon; but she will not be healed; and when the monied Jews clearly see this, the next effort will be to seek a refuge elsewhere before they wreck all in the useless effort to sustain that falling power. Such a discovery will be to them as "a voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her my people;" and it will be obeyed. This constitutes, in our opinion, one of the events of the battle of the great day of God Almighty; and will be one of the most mighty engines in breaking Babylon and all Catholic Europe in pieces—producing entire bankruptcy, and annihilating their power, bringing in a state of anarchy, fitly described by "doubling unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double"—producing "torment and sorrow" in all her borders. So the prophecy of Jeremiah, Jer. 51: 20, says—"Thou art my battle-axe and weapons of war; for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms." The removal of that people out of Catholic Europe, with what wealth is yet in their power, would be indeed the death blow to Babylon and her adherents; literally "breaking in pieces the nations, and destroying kingdoms." These things happen immediately after a time that Babylon had exultingly said—"I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow;" the exact state of that power two years ago, when almost all the world were ready to extol the head of Babylon to

heaven, and her praises were in every land; but already the hisses of *hatred* to the whore begin to be heard on every side, and indications increase that the period is just at hand when her flesh will be eaten, and she burned with fire. Then will the wailing described in the remainder of Rev. 18, be heard from those who have been in her interests, and who have enriched themselves by her idolatries and corruptions. The joy of the saints at that event, chap. 19: 1—9, we shall consider in another article.

LETTERS.

Sister C. C. Williams, Beaver Dam, N. Y., writes:

Br. Storrs:—I know not how it is with others, but for myself I can say it is a great satifaction as well as pleasure to be able to do a little towards disenthralling the mind of the mass, which the Man of Sin has so long kept enchained. I rejoice that his hour seems near, and his destruction certain. The invincible sword, the Word of God, I feel will triumph. Truth will and must prevail. Man will find out what he is, and what he needs, and those who learn that, cannot but adore the Being who planned and executed such a work as has been wrought for them, to secure to them something worthy of being brought into being, and for undergoing here a course of trial—*viz.*: eternal life. I love to think, talk or write upon it: yes, and work too, to spread the light abroad. I think it must be truth, it looks so light. Error does not thus, but blinds, looks mysterious; and the more one tries to extricate themselves the more entangled they become. But this, to me, seems a potent way of combating self-styled Orthodoxy: and is cheap, too: to put these works on immortality into the hands of all who will read them. And I think they can hardly fail of exciting a spirit of inquiry to know whether or not these things are so. I wish more would feel the importance of doing so, as well as the comfort of it, and we should soon see the battle raging and volunteers enlisting; either on the side of Truth or Error, a stand would be taken. I desire to see the work go on.—[$3 enclosed.—Ed. Ex.]

Br. Parker Sawyer, Hampton, N. Y., writes:

Br. Storrs:—It gives me pleasure to be instrumental in extending the circulation of the Examiner, Dobney and the Six Sermons, for I believe they are and will be productive of great good, founded, as I firmly believe, upon the Eternal truth of God, as revealed in his word. They are full of life and comfort to the Christian, and contain a rational appeal to the sincere Universalist, who, on new ground to him, is met and refuted; whilst the Infidel listens with almost profound silence. I am with you with all my heart, now and ever in the fearless defense of *Gospel truth*, though foes may deride and friends forsake. Yours truly.

Br. J. B. Tyler, Lackawack, N. Y., writes:

Br. Storrs:—By the smiles of a good Providence, two months past I have had comfortable health, after a tedious afflictive five months under a chronic inflammation of the bronchia. I have enjoyed the monthly visits of the Examiner, and often think how little the earthly compensation you have for the care and responsibility of its publication. Will you send me eight or ten copies of your Six Sermons, quarto? I think to circulate them among my neighbors. Enclosed is one dollar for subscription and sermons; I wish it were $10 for the same; or that I could help you in your labor more. I hope to help you more in future. From your well-wishing and praying brother.

Br. Geo. W. Burnham, N. Y., writes:

Dear Br. Storrs:—Your works are in considerable demand, the people *will* investigate the question—the *Bible* question of their final destiny. "Behold, I come quickly and my reward is with me"—says Christ. The question arises *who* is to be rewarded, and *what* is that reward. God has spoken who shall not fear? *We* are interested in the investigation of this subject.

Our late tent meetings have been the means of good to the people. New ones, and men of influence, have stepped into our thinned ranks. Present movements among the nations are rousing up the lovers of the Bible to inquire what of the night? what do these things indicate? Our faith is unwavering in the speedy advent of Zion's Deliverer.

May God preserve you, and the Saints with you and us, in the truth, until that day. Yours, in the hope of Eternal Life in the Kingdom of God.

Br. James Donaldson, Detroit, writes:—

Br. Storrs:—May grace, mercy and peace be with you and all the Israel of God. Amen.

I was sorry on receiving Examiner No. 5, to hear that you were embarrassed with your paper. I sorrow to think that you should be devoted to the dissemination of truth, and in return be encumbered with debt. This must not be; no, no. I hope your readers will comply at once with your request, to furnish new subscribers, and thus relieve you from embarrassment. Not only so, but express their readiness to pay one dollar or *two* per year. I hope a determined effort will be made to secure the weekly or semi-monthly publication of the Examiner. I am glad you have noticed objections to the Examiner. Many of your readers, so far as I am acquainted, say, we are with Br. Storrs on the immortality question, but want more on the advent: we wish to hear more from Brs. Storrs and Walsh on the Kingdom, and don't agree with you that the advent papers make up what is wanted. We desire an exposition of the Prophets, to enlighten the heads and warm the hearts of those watching for Christ from Heaven. My prayer is, that you may be abundantly blessed in your labors for truth. Yours, in hope of eternal life.—[$2 enclosed.—Ed. Ex.]

☞ Books.—D. Roberts, P. M., Tremont, Ill., sent us a letter dated Aug. 18th, stating that there is a package of nine copies of our Six Sermons in the Post Office at that place, addressed to "J. G. Yarick, Bloomingville, Ill." He says, "We know of no place of that name in this State," &c.; and states they will be retained at Tremont until he hears from us. We have no knowledge of sending the above named "package," and presume it must have been sent from Rochester, N. Y., or from some of our friends in Michigan. We give this notice, hoping that whoever forwarded the package will attend to it, and write to the Post Master of Tremont on the subject. Mr. Roberts will please accept our thanks for his attention to the matter.

☞ For Price of Books, Depositories, &c., see Examiner for July.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1849. No. 10.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW No. IX.

Mr. Lee's article, No. 11, is devoted to "the well known opinions of the Jews," in reference to the state of the dead.

In the opening sentence of this article, Mr. Lee says—"The Jews *have* ALWAYS believed in the conscious existence of the soul after the death of the body, and in its immortality."

This is not a fact—it is not true—and his evidence has failed to prove it, as we shall see.

1. We have before shown that, *before* the Babylonish captivity, the Jews observed the most profound silence in relation to the dead; and spoke of their state as one of darkness, silence and inactivity.

2. That *after* the Babylonish captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests, they adopted their language and ideas, on such subjects as those upon which their oracles were silent. *Let these facts be remembered*, for they disprove the assertion of Mr. Lee, that "the Jews have *always* believed in the conscious existence" of the dead, and the "immortality" of the soul. Let the reader, also, notice, that Mr. Lee's testimony does not extend back *to*, much less *beyond* this period. He has failed, then, to prove his *first* point.

Mr. Lee quotes from Josephus; and here let me state a principle in giving testimony. A witness, in deposing to a fact or truth, is required and expected to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Josephus tells us what the Jews believed in his day; but he does not tell us they "*always*" so believed. He gives us to understand that they believed in the immortality of the soul, in a restricted sense; but he does not stop there, and, if his testimony upon the subject is to be received as evidence of the *truth* of the doctrine, we must receive it all or none. Josephus says—"the Pharisees believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that *under the earth* there will be *rewards* and punishments." This was the great "national doctrine," to use Mr. Lee's words. Let Mr. Lee, then, be a Pharisee in all this, as the doctrine was not *specially* condemned by our Lord! This testimony proves *too much*, and what proves too much, proves nothing. This is all in harmony with Mr. Lee's pagan witnesses. They also proved too much for Mr. Lee's cause.

While it is admitted then, that the mass of the Jews believed in the pagan doctrine of immortality, Mr. Lee gains nothing from the admission; because we have seen from whence they derived these ideas—ideas upon which their oracles were silent. And the fact, that they placed "*rewards* and *punishments* UNDER THE EARTH," clearly enough indicates their pagan origin.

According to the testimony of Josephus, the Pharisees did not believe in the resurrection of pagans: for he says "they believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them; and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life: and the vicious are to be *detained in an everlasting prison*, but that the *virtuous* SHALL HAVE POWER TO REVIVE AND LIVE AGAIN." Antiq. B. xviii. C. 1. 3. In another place he says—"they say that all the souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of *good men* only are *removed into other bodies*"—that is, they are transmigrated. In a word, from all the testimony of Josephus, we come to the following conclusions: 1. They believed the heathen would not be raised from the dead. 2. That the righteous children of Abraham only would rise. 3. That his *unrighteous* children would not rise, but be detained in the prison house of the dead forever. 4. That the souls of good men passed into other bodies, or were transmigrated. So that Josephus' testimony proves more than Mr. Lee desires; and, if it be good on one point, it should certainly be received on collateral points. But the Lord has put the seal of condemnation upon the doctrines of both Sadducees and Pharisees. He said to his disciples—"BEWARE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PHARISEES AND OF THE SADDUCEES." They were both wrong; the Sadducees occupied one extreme, and the Pharisees another. And, as we have before seen, these views were Babylonish in their origin; and are not supported by the Jewish Scriptures.

Mr. Lee refers to the "Jews' Service Book;" and in reference to this I will only quote the language of Christ—"In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." And again—"Ye make void the law through your traditions."

Mr. Lee also goes into the Apocrypha; and for what purpose does he go there? To prove that "the Jews *always* believed in the immortality of the soul?" If so, his evidence fails, because the Apocrypha, according to his admission, was "written before the Christian era;" but not before the Babylonish captivity! But, were I disposed, I could show from the very passages Mr. Lee has quoted from Esdras and the wisdom of Solomon, that he totally misapprehends and misapplies all the quotations he makes. But I do not deem the document of sufficient importance to do so. I will, however, proceed to show that the most authoritative parts of the Apocrypha, those bearing the names of some of the authors of some of the books

composing the Bible, teach a very different doctrine from Mr. Lee's.

First, then, as a specimen, read 2 Esdras vii. 31, "And after seven days the world, that yet waketh not, shall be raised up, *and that shall die that is corrupt.*" If this refer to the resurrection, which it appears to do, from the context, then it proves the "second death" of the "corrupt," which Mr. Lee denies. Again, at the 15th verse—"Now therefore, why disquietest thou thyself, seeing thou art but *a* CORRUPTIBLE MAN? and why art thou moved, whereas *thou art but* MORTAL?"

But let us examine the "Wisdom of Solomon," which has a much higher claim than the Book of Esdras, and see what he says on the question of death and immortality. Chapter i. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16—"*Seek not death in the error of your life:* and pull not upon yourselves destruction with the works of your hands. For God made not death: neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. For he created all things that they might *have their being:* and the generations of the world were healthful; and there is no poison of destrnction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth: (FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS IS IMMORTAL;) but *ungodly men* with their *works* and *words* called it to them: for when they thought to have it their friend, *they* CONSUMED TO NAUGHT, *and made a covenant with it,* because *they are worthy to take part with it.*" This certainly does not teach the natural immortality of the soul. Again, in the 2d chapter, "*For God created man* TO BE IMMORTAL, and made him to be an *image of his own eternity;* nevertheless," notwithstanding this purpose on the part of God, "through envy of the devil came death into the world; *and they that do hold of his side* DO FIND IT." Here it is clearly taught, that God, when he created man, designed his immortality—his eternal life, but that through the envy of the devil, death came into the world, and those who hold of his side, find death their portion. The passage Mr. Lee quotes from the 3d chapter, he totally misapplies. "In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die," in the Sadducean sense of not living again, "*but they are in peace.*" "This hope is full of immortality," which it could not be, if they already possessed it, for "hope" relates to the future—"*the time of their visitation,*" which is spoken of in the 7th and 8th verses. The reader is requested to turn to the 7th chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon, and read the five first verses, and compare it with what we have already quoted here; and, also, what we have elsewhere said on the nature of man.

I will quote one passage more from the Apocrypha; it is found in Ecclesiasticus xvii. 27–32. "Who shall praise the most high *in the grave,* instead of them which *live* and give thanks? *Thanksgiving* PERISHETH FROM THE DEAD, AS FROM ONE THAT IS NOT: the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. *For all things cannot be in men,* BECAUSE THE SON OF MAN IS NOT IMMORTAL." Again, he says—"*All men are but earth and ashes.*" The Wisdom of Solomon was doubtless written *before* the Babylonish Captivity, and Ecclesiasticus appears to have been written about, or a little *after* that time. Thus we have proved, first, that the Jews did not "*always*" believe in the immortality of the soul; and, secondly, that, even after their return from Babylon, one of their principal writers, the author of Ecclesiasticus, did not teach it; all of which is in harmony with the Bible. Mr. Lee's cause has gained nothing, I apprehend, by going into the Apocrypha!

He next appeals to the Bible; but, alas! for his theory, he crucifies it afresh, and puts it to public shame! He quotes Math. xiv. 26, and Luke xxiv. 36–39, Mark vi. 49.

In Matthew and Mark the original word is *phantasma,* a phantom; and such is also the marginal reading in Luke. In the cases recorded by Matthew and Mark, the disciples thought they saw a *phantom,* but they were *mistaken,* as all other persons have been ever since. Let the reader notice, then, that in the only cases recorded, where the disciples supposed they saw a *phantom—ghost,* they were deceived; and that there is not a case differing from this on record!

In the case referred to by Luke, we have the subject presented in all its power and force. The Lord Jesus had arisen from the dead; his Father "had shown him the path of life," and "demonstrated him as his son, by his resurrection from the dead"—"death" now "had no more dominion over him,"—he was immortal—and as such he appears in their midst! "They were terrified and affrighted and supposed they had seen a spirit—a *phantasma,* or phantom—ghost. And now he proceeds to *correct* their ideas of such things by asking, "Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts! Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit—*a phantasma*—hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet." Thus *correcting* their errors on the subject of spirit, or *phantoms,* and, at the same time, *demonstrating the* MATERIALITY OF SPIRITUAL BODIES!

Here is "a quickening spirit," as Paul says, with "*flesh* and *bones, hands* and *feet.*" Here we have a glorious specimen of a spiritual, immortal body—not "immaterial," but *material*—real—tangible; something which could be "*handled*" and "*seen!*" What becomes of Mr. Lee's "immaterial soul" in the light of this fact? His theory is exploded! his foundation demolished! his superstructure crumbled into dus,t and his theology a thing of nought! the *ignis fatuus* of a day! This fact, I repeat it, sweeps away Mr. Lee's whole theory of "immateriality," demolishes Mr. Drew's logic, and nullifies all the rhetoric of Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates, and Zoroaster. It eclipses all the philosophy of Babylonia, Egypt, Media, Persia, Greece and Rome! It swallows up all the traditions of the Jewish Service Book, Josephus, and the Apocrypha! It casts into the shade all the learning of Pharisees and Sadducees, ancient or modern! *because it is* LIFE AND IMMORTALITY BROUGHT TO LIGHT!!"

Mr. Lee refers to Acts xxiii. 8. Mr. Brewster made a better use of this than Mr. Lee has done; and as we have fully responded to his arguments on this point, we must refer the reader to our discussion with Rev. Wm. H. Brewster. Mr. Lee's logical *reputation* is greater than his *philosophical* and *scriptural* STRENGTH. Truth is mighty above all things, and will prevail! J. T. W.

The Editor of the Examiner, in his late visit east, had a good time with friends in Boston and Cabotville, Mass.; and preached three times in the latter, and five times in the former place, to good and attentive congregations.

IMMATERIALITY.

The following communication is from a Methodist Minister; who, though not with us on all points, says, in a private note,—"On the great question—'What will be the doom of the wicked?' I am fully with you; and intend ere long to give public utterance to the truth of God on this awful subject." He adds—"I feel thankful to God that I have seen your Sermons and Dobney's book. For years my mind has been painfully perplexed with the doctrine of interminable suffering. I have thought and read of hell as a world of immortal wo, where countless millions curse themselves, each other, and the Almighty, until I have been confounded: but I have done with the doctrine and all its perplexities. The wicked shall be burnt up with unquenchable fire; and afterwards every creature in heaven and on earth shall ascribe blessing, &c., to Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb for ever."

The name of the author of this communication has never appeared in the Examiner: he is therefore a new accession to this side of the question: but he alone is responsible for the sentiments of his article. We hope to hear from him again.

If the Human Soul be Immaterial, how can we account for the origin of its existence?

Br. Storrs:—I have recently been much interested in this question. The following article is submitted to your consideration, which you may print if you think proper to do so, and if not, you may return it at my expense.

Admitting the human soul to be immaterial, there are four ways, in any one of which we may suppose it to have originated. 1st. We can suppose it to have been created out of previously existing immaterial substance. 2d. We can suppose it to have been created out of the immaterial substance of one or of both the parents who were the means of its existence. 3d. We can suppose it created out of the Divine substance. 4th. We can suppose it to have been created out of nothing. These include every possible mode of accounting for the origin of the soul, if the soul be an immaterial essence. Assuming this view of the nature of the soul, I propose to show that it could not in any of the above ways come into being, and therefore there is no such immaterial soul in existence.

I. Did God create the soul out of previously existing immaterial substance? I answer, 1st. The existence of such substance is hypothetical. I do not know of any immaterialist of the present day, who maintains such an opinion respecting the origin of the soul. 2d. If such immaterial substance did exist previous to the creation of our immaterial soul, it either possessed the essential properties of spirit, or it did not. If it did not, then immaterial substance is not necessarily spirit. Suppose then this substance did possess the essential properties of spirit. In this case, according to immaterialists, it must have had thought, consciousness, and all the elements of personality. In other words, it must have been an intelligent, spiritual being; essentially one and the same; immutably and eternally incapable of multiplication or division. Immaterialists themselves being the judges, our immaterial soul could not be created out of the essence of such a being.

Let us suppose this immaterial substance to have been impersonal, unconscious, and unintelligent. Still it must have been essentially *one*, or it must have been *multifarious*. If essentially one, then it is plain it could become the subject of only *one* consciousness and personality. No more than *one* soul could be created out of it. If there were different kinds of such substance, then each kind might become *one* soul, and only *one*. There must then have been as many different immaterial substances as there have been human souls in existence. Such a notion is surely too absurd to be maintained by the advocates of immaterialism.

If, however, any should incline to adopt this method of accounting for the origin of the soul, we have other difficulties to suggest to them. How came this previously existing immaterial substance into being? How could immaterial substance exist, and yet be utterly destitute of moral and intellectual properties? How could an unconscious and unintelligent substance be rendered conscious, intelligent, and the subject of personality? Immaterialists tell us that what is not matter is spirit, and that spirit is essentially conscious, intelligent, and active. Of course, if this be so, there could not be any unconscious, unintelligent, immaterial substance, out of which human souls were created.

II. Does God create the souls of children out of the immaterial substance of one or both of their parents?

Suppose the soul of a child to be created out of the immaterial substance of its father. But here we are in difficulty again. The soul of the father, we are told, is essentially an unit; it is indivisible. It cannot, then, be divided. It cannot furnish from its own essence the elements of a new existence. Passing over this difficulty, we will still suppose the soul of the child created from the soul of its father, and another difficulty is presented as formidable as the last. The father having parted with a portion of his immaterial essence, no longer has a soul, *whole and entire*. The second child of the same father must be supposed to receive another portion of his spirit, and so of all the succeeding children. Thus the father, after communicating, at different times, portions of his own essence to a score of children, can hardly be supposed to have any soul left. It is also evident, that before he became a father he must have had twenty times more immaterial substance, or soul, than any one of his children. Thus souls are diminishing in quantity, or amount of essence, every generation. In the course of ages, souls may become as small as immaterialists affirm them to be,—without extent, having no size, in other words, they exist nowhere.

The idea that the soul of a child is created out of the soul of his father, is evidently absurd, and must be abandoned. And if we suppose the soul of the infant to be created out of the immaterial essences of both parents, absurdities are increased and multiplied. In this, as in the former case, we have indivisible spirits divided, which is a contradiction. Neither father nor mother has a complete soul after the production of the child. And as the child is supposed to have a soul, which is compounded of

the substance of two immaterial, conscious, and immortal spirits, he must have in himself a double life, a double consciousness, a double identity; he must be the subject of a two-fold immortal existence. Such are the contradictions and impossibilities in which we are involved, by supposing the soul of a child to be created out of the immaterial substance, of one, or both of its parents.

III. Does God create souls out of his own essence?

This cannot be, according to immaterialists, for they tell us God is one, and indivisible for ever. But if souls be created out of the divine essence, God is divided into as many parts as there are human souls in existence.

If the human soul be a part of the essence of God, it must be a partaker of the attributes of God. The attributes of God inhere, essentially and eternally, in the divine substance. If, then, human souls are portions of the divine essence, they must share in the divine perfections, many of which are said to be incommunicable. In reality, God is the only intelligent Being. Every human mind is a ray of the infinite light; a drop of the eternal ocean. In the language of Pope:

> "All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
> Whose body nature is, and God the soul."

It either follows, then, that whatever is, is right, or if there be such a thing as moral evil, the Divine Being, in his innumerable individualizations, is the only transgressor of moral law. Every false opinion, every evil passion, every wrong action, is thus charged upon that great and glorious Being who is Light and Love, and in whom there is no darkness at all. Now, no immaterialist will contend for such absurdities. We are thus forced to the conclusion, that God does not create human souls of his own essence.

IV. Does God create human souls out of nothing?

I formerly entertained the common opinion of the origin of the Universe, that it was produced out of nothing. But I have been compelled to abandon that idea, as involving an absolute impossibility. None will pretend that finite immaterial minds can create something out of nothing; while many do maintain that the Almighty did, from nonentity, call all things into being. Let me ever speak of God with the deepest reverence. I believe he can do whatever in the nature of things is possible; but there are some things which are beyond the limits of omnipotence. God cannot annihilate his own being. He could not create a being equal to himself. I doubt whether God could compress all the matter in the Universe, so that it would occupy no more space than a grain of sand. According to immaterialists, God cannot divide a soul into parts, nor destroy a soul by the action of matter upon it. I do not accuse them of irreverence for holding such opinion, nor shall I be rashly censured by candid men, when I assign the following reasons for not believing in the production of something out of nothing.

1st. I cannot find that the Bible anywhere teaches the creation of anything out of nothing.

2d. If something was produced out of nothing, it must have been so produced by the action of Deity. But action necessarily implies two things: 1st, an actor; 2d, an object acted upon. The actor may act upon himself, or upon something which is not himself. Let us try both cases.

1st. Does God produce immaterial souls by acting on himself?

This brings us to view the subject again, very nearly in the light in which it is presented in our third supposition. Now, if we answer the question just proposed in the affirmative, we must maintain that God has divided his indivisible essence into parts, and of these parts constituted human souls. Here we have a contradiction and an absurdity,—a contradiction, because an indivisible essence cannot be divided; and an absurdity, because, according to this view, every human soul, and every devil, is a part of God.

Again: These separate parts of the divine substance, which are supposed to be individualized in different souls, either have their original properties or they have not: if they have, then the consciousness of every soul is the consciousness of God; the will of every soul is the will of God; and the errors of every soul are the errors of God. This will not be maintained by immaterialists. Let us, then, suppose that these portions of the divine substance have *not* their original properties. Here are two difficulties: 1st. These parts of the divine essence could not exist for a moment, after being deprived of their essential properties. 2d. New properties in the abstract could not be created and made to inhere in these parts of the divine nature. It is therefore impossible for human souls to be created out of the essence of God, by the action of God upon himself.

I may here remark, that if God could produce souls by acting on his own nature, these souls would not be created out of nothing, which is the point now under consideration.

Does God, then, create souls by acting on something which is not himself?

This could not be, according to most immaterialists, for they tell us there was a period when only God existed. Besides himself, there was neither matter nor spirit. Of course, then, out of himself there was no object to act upon. Now, as an exercise of power necessarily implies an object to be acted upon, it follows, that if there ever was a period when nothing besides God existed, nothing but God could have existed to all eternity.

All will admit that the creation of something out of nothing is an impossibility with finite beings; but many will maintain that such a creation is possible with God because he is omnipotent. I believe in the divine omnipotence; but what can omnipotence do without materials to work upon? What can it effect when set in operation (if this were possible) on boundless nonentity? In the arithmetic of mortals, a thousand times nothing amounts to nothing, and this is an absolute and immutable truth in the multiplication table of God Almighty. The fact that our power is limited, and God's power is infinite, does not touch the question. No being, finite nor infinite, can think without a subject of thought. No being can exercise desire or love without some object to be desired or loved. None will pretend that God could exercise his benevolence upon nonentity. So neither can power act upon nonentity. Hence the production of souls out of nothing is an infinite and eternal impossibility.

I am thus led to the conclusion that an immaterial soul could not be created out of previously

existing immaterial substance, nor out of the souls of parents, nor out of the divine essence, nor out of nothing. And as an immaterial soul could not be produced in any other way, I am compelled to believe there is no such thing in existence.

As my sheet is not full, I will suggest whether the notion, that the soul was created by God out of nothing, is not utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of man's constitutional depravity. Here let me quote Wesley, who represents the thoughts of millions on this subject. "In Adam all died, all human kind, all the children of men who were then in Adam's loins. The natural consequence of this is, that every one descended from him comes into the world spiritually dead, dead to God, wholly dead in sin; entirely devoid of the life of God; void of the image of God, of all that righteousness and holiness wherein Adam was created. Instead of this, every man born into the world now bears the image of the devil, in pride and self-will; the image of the beast, in sensual appetites and desires. This, then, is the foundation of the New Birth,—the entire corruption of our nature." Such is said to be the state of a human being "when he comes into the world." This is affirmed of the immaterial soul, and of it *only;* for immaterialists tell us the body possesses no quality of an intellectual or moral nature: every such quality belongs to the soul. Now, if the soul be made out of nothing, a human father can have no more to do with the production of the souls of his children, than with the creation of so many worlds. How, then, can a father's acts affect the moral nature and condition of the souls of his children, and the relation of these souls to God? To me this seems impossible. If the soul alone develops thought and volition, and if it be created by God out of nothing, then we must refer the first moral state of the soul to God, and not to Adam. If the soul is naturally destitute of holiness, God made it so. If the soul has in itself the germs of pride, malice, envy, bitterness and blasphemy, God put these germs into it. If the soul go astray from the womb, speaking lies, God interwove a principle of falsehood in its constitution. Whatever is natural to the soul must be referred to the being who gave the soul its nature, and not to the beings who were merely the instruments of providing for it a house of clay, in which it might pass a short term of existence.

THETA.

MASS., *September 14th*, 1849.

DR. I. F. LEE, AND THE BAPTISTS.

TO THE BAPTISTS *scattered throughout the bounds of the Moriah Association, and elsewhere, greeting:—*

Whereas the Meadow Branch Baptist Church has charged the undersigned with the promulgation of sentiments heretical, and subversive of the Christian system, thereby justifying themselves in his exclusion from their body, hoping that no church will receive the letter of dismission granted him upwards of two years ago, and which they are led to think he still retains, contrary to the wish of said church: Be it known unto you, 1st. That the sentiments, which the undersigned has promulgated, are not contrary to Scripture. 2d. They are not therefore either heretical, or subversive of the Christian system. 3d. As to the letter of dismission, he neither retains it still, nor holds it contrary to the wish of the Church, and therefore cannot present it to any other church whatever. The letter then of the Meadow Branch Baptist Church is a misrepresentatin from beginning to end. The undersigned might, in strict propriety, let the matter here rest, and demand the proof of their assertions, but he prefers an exposure of the misrepresentation, believing it will be acceptable to his friends, serviceable to his enemies, and instead of subverting the Christian system, establish the truth of those sentiments, and prove hermeneutically that they are the Revelation of the Almighty, and not the *inventions* of man.

The Meadow Branch Baptist Church was apprised of the fact, that he was not a member of their church at the time (Feb. 1849,) nor for upwards of twelve months previous; that he had disposed of the letter of dismission in the summer of 1847. What then, dear brethren, can you think of a church, who wilfully, and deliberately publish that which they know is a misrepresentation? What could have prompted them to such an act? It has been said that it was *slavish*, servile fear—the fear of man—the fear of the Moriah Baptist Association! That if they did not exclude Dr. Lee, the Association would exclude them!! That is, if they did not exclude an individual who was not a member of their church at the time—an impossibility—aye, if they did not commit an impossibility, the Moriah Association would sever them from her sisterhood!! And this egregious folly was premeditated by a very few, (it is feared, not some of *that few* who are saved,) while the majority, an overwhelming majority, of the Association knew nothing of the plot. How strange! to bear false testimony against a neighbor, to indulge in wilful misrepresentations, to take fiction for fact, and fact for fiction; to take Scripture for heresy, and Bible sentiment as subversive of the Bible; and call all this orthodoxy! Strange as it may seem, it is nothing more than the Meadow Branch Baptist Church has done, under the penal law of the Moriah Baptist Association. Two or three very active agents in the plot believe that the *soul of man* is *the essence* of God! And that the wicked will be raised incorruptible, immortal—spiritual bodies. Glorious! For, saith one of these essences of Deity, Paul, in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, is speaking of the resurrection of the wicked as well as the saints! Is this orthodoxy? It may be the Moriah Baptist Association sentiments, but not surely the declaration of God. But what are these sentiments which the Meadow Branch Baptist Church, in common with the Association of which she is a beloved and pliant sister, believe to be *heretical* and *subversive* of the Christian system, and a renunciation of which would be a great recommendation to an ordained minister of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ? Let us look into that gospel, and examine and see if it contains such sentiments as Dr. Lee has openly promulgated. And if, after impartial and thorough examination according to the *sacred canon*, we find sentiments verbally, *hermeneutically* such as Dr. Lee believes and has promulgated, it must necessarily follow that they are scriptural, not heretical; and instead of subverting Christianity, they are in verity a part of that Divine system itself, *how subversive soever of the sentiments of those who reject the word of God*, and prefer the blasphemous idea that the soul of

the wicked is the essence of Deity, and therefore is undying, and must live for ever!

To the law and the testimony. 1st. Dr. Lee believes and has promulgated the following sentiments, which the Meadow Branch Church pronounces heretical and subversive of the Christian system.

Gen. 3: 22: 'And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore,' &c. 23. The sentence of death is passed, and, *in mercy*, God expels Adam and Eve from Paradise, or the garden of Eden; for he did not wish them to live for ever in a state so wretched. The penalty of *mortality* was not remitted, for "dust thou art," &c., and the penalty of the law, death, *eternal death*, were it not for the interposition of mercy, through a Saviour, would have been inflicted on Adam and Eve.

Ezekiel 18: 40. 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' Rom. 6: 23. 'For the wages of sin *is* death.' 21. 'The end of those things *is* death.' 2: 12. 'For as many as have sinned without law, shall also *perish* without law'—16—'in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.' 1: 32. 'Who, knowing *the judgment of God*, that they which commit such things are worthy of *death*.' This, then, is the judgment of God, that the wicked are worthy of death—that they shall *perish* in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul, his life? Or what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul—his own life?

Job 21: 30. "The wicked is reserved unto the day of destruction—they shall be brought forth to day of wrath"—*death—eternal death*. Ezk. 18: 18, 24, 31, 32, 26. 33: 9 13, 18. Matt. 3: 10, 12. 5: 29, 30. 7: 13, 16, 19. 10: 28. 13: 40, 50, 16: 25, 28. 18: 8, 9. Acts 3: 23. 8: 20 2 Peter 2: 1, 17. Here it is declared that the wicked shall be destroyed—shall lose their life—be burnt up—shall perish—utterly perish. Again, John 3: 36. 'he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.' And again, Malachi 4: 1. 'For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither *root* nor *branch*.' From the foregoing passages it is evident that the final destiny of the wicked is destruction, everlasting destruction, death, eternal death. And we think we have the mind of the Lord when we say, that eternal death, and not eternal life in misery, is the judgment of God against the wicked. This we believe from the force of testimony more numerous and overwhelming, in one sense of the word, than that in favor of baptism being immersion. We have one solitary word to prove immersion, i. e. baptizo. This, with the phrase, going down into the water, &c., in Jordan, and buried with him in baptism, &c., constitutes all the proof we have, and all that we require. Let us now return to the future punishment of the wicked, and what hermeneutically is the testimony in its favor, and who is the author of that testimony or evidence by which we believe? Consume, devour, destroy, destruction, perdition, die, death, perish, utterly perish, everlasting destruction, eternal death, are the words chiefly employed, when speaking of the future and final punishment of the wicked, &c. We would request then that you study them *hermeneutically*, and consult a Latin Dictionary. Look carefully and critically at the words, *consumo*, *destruo*, *devoro*, destructio, *pereo* (from *per* and *eo* literally, to depart wholly,) perditio (from *perdo*, entire loss, utter destruction,) and then turn to Webster's large, and enlarged Dictionary, last published, 1848—and say whether these sentiments are heretical and subversive of the Christian system? But the public mind, says Mr. Forcible Feeble, is against the doctrine, aye, and the overwhelming prejudices of the churches. Yea, verily, adds Deacon S.; and then how are we to alarm sinners, if *we* take away the fear of undying torture in eternal and *devouring* fire? Alas! the man who will yield to public opinion or the prejudices of the whole religious world, when that opinion and prejudice is contrary to the word of God, is not fit for the Church of God, and is a dishonor to the ministry. We know we have the mind of the Lord when we say, that it is not the fear of undying torture, but the goodness of God, that leadeth man to repentance.

All the classic Greek writers, all Lexicons, have been sifted and examined, minutely, thoroughly, to prove what? That *baptizo* means to dip, plunge, immerse. Must a man, then, renounce his reason, his knowledge of other words besides baptise—deny the import and meaning of the words used in speaking of the punishment of the wicked—declare that the judgment of God relative to the wicked is heresy! and that the doctrine contained in the word of God is contrary to the word of God; and that God, therefore, does not mean what he says;—must a man do all this before he can be received again into full fellowship and fellow feeling with the Meadow Branch Baptish Church? The import of words must first be changed; all Dictionaries and Lexicons altered essentially—nay, even then the judgment of God remains immutably the same. Think you, brethren, that all the proofs in favor of the punishment of the wicked being that of utter destruction and not eternal life in misery, have been enumerated? Throughout the whole Bible there is not one passage, not one solitary phrase, that favors the common notion of immortality in sin, or eternal life to the wicked. No, not one text to show the soul is in its present condition undying or immortal. True, that immortality is promised to those who, by patient continuance in well-doing, are seeking for honor and glory and immortality, eternal life. These great and glorious blessings are promised to the saints, through Jesus Christ. They are not inherent in man—not even in the righteous, much less in the wicked. Nor are they conferred on mortals, before the resurrection. Corruption must put on incorruption—mortality, immortality; the natural body must be raised a spiritual body. When does this take place? At death? Nay, but in the resurrection.

Christ was manifested in the flesh, that he might *destroy* the works of the devil. This the devil himself believes. Art thou come to destroy us before the time? The belief of the Meadow Branch Church, then, is not so correct on this point as that of the devil. He knows the truth in this respect, believes it, and trembles. But the Meadow Branch Baptist Church denies the truth of God, and neither fears nor trembles, but unblushingly publishes to the world that the truth of God is heresy! Would to

God that they had the wisdom of the serpent, and the harmlessness of the dove.

Meltonville, N. C. I. F. Lee.

LETTER FROM BR. J. B. FRISBIE.

The writer of the following letter has been a minister, and traveling elder, we believe, in the Protestant Methodist Church, for a number of years. Some months ago our Six Sermons were put into his hands, if we recollect right, by Br. Catlin of Kingsbury, Ind., which he has examined with Dobney on Future Punishment, comparing them with the Scriptures, the result of which will be learned from his letter. Our Br. Catlin and other brethren in the west are doing their work faithfully in scattering the doctrine of immortality only through Christ, and that by a resurrection from the dead; thus showing the *importance* of the "second advent," as our only hope for a future life. We trust they will abide in this good work and not *compromise* it to please men.

Sylvan, Mich., Sept. 7th, 1849.

Brother Storrs,—It is with pleasure I now inform you that I have closely examined your Six Sermons, and also Mr. Dobney on Future Punishment: able works, the truth of which nothing but prejudice, and a blind zeal for creeds, sects, and parties, can gainsay or resist. With much interest I have perused your valuable paper, and have been delighted with the discussions therein, and have faithfully compared them all with the Bible.

About seven years since I was fully convinced that the idea of the natural immortality of the soul was a heathen doctrine; but have believed that immortality was in Christ, by virtue of the atonement, for all, but am now ready to acknowledge that the Bible does not teach the immortality and eternal life (which I consider synonymous) for any but those, "who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honor and IMMORTALITY, ETERNAL LIFE." It appears that Christ, by his obedience and death, *abolished death*, and brought *life and immortality* to light through the gospel: 2 Tim. 1: 10. It is strange, that some should labor to prove that life and immortality should be brought to light through the light of the impress of the heathens, or reason, or the light of nature. To "put on immortality," (1 Cor. 15: 53, 54,) does not look much like an immortal soul's putting on an immortal body, or a mortal body's putting on an immortal soul, but "this *mortal* shall put on *immortality*," in the resurrection. Under this I will place, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Ezek. 18: 4 and 20. Also, "Let him *know* that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a *soul* from *death*. James 5: 20, does teach that a sinner's soul may die. Solomon says, "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" at death: Eccl. 3: 19. "The dead know not anything." David says, man without redemption is "like the beasts that perish:" Ps. 49. "While I live I will praise the Lord—while I have any being"—"his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146: 2 and 4. I am not so clear on the intermediate state as I could wish. One reason why, I suppose, is, I had imbibed the notion that demons were the spirits of the wicked dead, according to Josephus, W. B. 7, sec. 6.

As to the destruction of the wicked after death, I feel very well satisfied on that point, at present. As sure as eternal life means future and endless life, so sure the opposite must be future and endless death, perish, and destruction, which are the common terms in contrast with life, eternal life, &c. Nowhere can I find that the wicked are to have eternal life, or that they are immortal, or are to put on immortaliiy in the resurrection. For this is spoken only of brethren or Christians, who have sought immortality: Rom. 2: 7; they put on immortality in the resurrection. 1 Corth. 15: 50—54. "He that hath sown to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." Now this I see is not the first death that we inherited in Adam. For, this is for our own deeds, and contrasted with life everlasting, which places it in the future, viz., the second death—"Death unto death"—"Utterly perish"—"End destruction"—"Destroy both soul and body in hell"—"punished with everlasting destruction." A word as to the resurrection, then I close this article. I came to the firm conclusion that if I could find proof in the scriptures that the wicked might rise *mortal*, that assuredly they would die again. No sooner had I come to this conclusion than this text came to my mind, satisfactory to the point—"Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection:" Heb. 11: 35. The contrast is between the women's children raised by the prophet back to this mortal life, and the better, or immortal resurrection. If these worthies had accepted deliverance, it appears they would never had a better resurrection than a mortal one, and die again. This is in exact agreement with the text, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in *this world*, shall keep it unto *life eternal*." Here the contrast is between the life in this world and life eternal; which makes its loss one with death eternal. See Mat. 10: 39, Mar. 8: 35. Yours in the hope of immortality.

J. B. Frisbie.

"INFANTS—SOUL AND BODY."

Under this caption, the True Wesleyan, for Sept. 1, takes exceptions to a sentiment of some of its exchanges, which is this, "the body of the *infant* is corrupt or fallen, and depraved. This depravity is hereditary; *but the soul is a new creation of God*, not derived from the earthly parent." The Wesleyan uses up this notion very handsomely, and says, "The Bible affirms that God is the Maker of the body as clearly as it does that he is the Maker of the soul." It adds, "'Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac begat Jacob.' But if souls are not begotten as well as bodies, Abraham did not beget Isaac, or else the term Isaac does not include a soul. If men are not begotten, then souls are no part of men."

The Wesleyan overthrows its exchange in the argument, but demolishes itself along with it, for the doctrine of the Wesleyan is, that the soul is "immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible."

Now if it is "*immaterial*," how does the action of *matter*, in generation, communicate it? And if it is *indivisible*, how could Abraham give or communicate a soul to Isaac? It could not be an offshoot from his own, for that would make his soul *divisible*, and the Wesleyan says it is "indivisible." We cannot see, if Abraham communicated Isaac's soul to him, but what it must still have been Abraham's soul in Isaac, if the soul is not divisible; and then we do not see how there can be more than *one* soul for the whole human family; and as that is "indivisible." it is a *family* soul: hence it follows that the action of any one man must be the action of the *family* soul; so if one man sins, it is a *family* sin, or if one man acts virtuously it is a *family* virtue. Again, as the soul is "indivisible," all men must have the same common destiny: say, for example, that if Abraham should be lost, Isaac must be lost, for the soul can't be divided; and so, whatever is the fate of the first man, Adam, must be the fate of all the men of his race, or else the soul must be divisible; and then, what would become of the Wesleyan's theory of its indivisibility? Happy for man, however, we have the assurance that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are saved, and that proves Adam and Eve were, and that all their posterity must inevitably be so too—for "*the soul is indivisible.*" Truly the Wesleyan has helped our opponents to a short and certain route to universal salvation. Can you get out of that dilemna, Br. Wesleyan, without abandoning your theory? The Examiner is open for your answer, and we will show you how we can equal you in "courtesy."

We see Br. Lee's difficulty. It all grows out of the assumption that the soul is an *entity*—a real being or existence—and not an *attribute*. The soul of man is an attrribute of man, an inherent quality, that which pertains to man as man, as *an organism*. To use one of Br. Lee's own expressions, "The soul, whose very existence is *thought*." Never did a theologian better define the soul than he has done, fatal as it is to his entire theory, which he has labored to sustain in "22" articles in the True Wesleyan.

The question between the Wesleyan and its "exchange" stands thus: Are the souls [thoughts] of men, or of *infants*, a new creation of God, or are they propagated by generation from father to child?

According to Br. Lee, (see last Examiner) the soul is a "living consciousness," and "is known to exist only from its thoughts;" now, how little "living consciousness" does an "infant" manifest? and as the soul "is known to exist *only* from its thoughts," how will Br. Lee prove that "infants" have any souls at all? Does he know anything of their thoughts? He has said that "animals do not think;" that what appears to be the result of thought in them is only *instinct*. There are very few animals but what are quite equal in this respect to infants just born. After all, then, Br. Wesleyan, may it not be, according to your theory, that *infants* have no souls at all? So that you and your exchange may both be wrong.

The matter now seems to stand thus:—

The soul is thought, and can be known only by its thoughts:

But the infant is not KNOWN *to think:*

THEREFORE, *the infant has no soul, so far as known.*

Is this position true? And if not, how will our Br. Wesleyan disprove it, without abandoning some of his main arguments? Again, we say, the Examiner is open for Br. Lee's answer, with this *proviso*, viz., if we can possibly get funds to continue our paper. Now is a chance to prove our *generosity*.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"*He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*"—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The present number of our paper has been delayed from two causes; first, absence of funds; second, our own absence from the city. Since our last we have visited New England, and conversed with numbers of our friends, all of whom express the desire that we should continue to issue the Examiner; and are unanimous that the subscription price *ought* to be increased to one dollar per year; they assure us they will cheerfully pay that sum. Several persons have pledged themselves to be responsible for subscribers to the amount of the following sums for the coming year; *viz:*—

Adam Warthman, Philadelphia,	$15.00
Jacob Johnson, Millville, N. J.,	10.00
P. Dickinson, Boston, Mass.,	10.00
R. E. Ladd, Springfield, Mass.,	25.00

Br. Wm. Swinbue, Patterson N. J., writes, that we may calculate upon six or eight subscribers there for next year, where there were only four the present. Here is a good and encouraging beginning. Let us now hear from all our friends at once; because, we wish to be able to determine how many papers we shall print monthly before we commence the new volume. To print more than are called for is a loss to us, and not printing enough we shall fail to supply new subscribers. Cannot our friends say at once for how many dollars they will be responsible *during* the coming year? They need not remit to us only as they obtain subscribers, but let us know how much we may *certainly* depend upon from you to help us through the next volume. A monthly issue is all we can promise at present. We have no funds on hand for the November and December numbers of the Examiner, yet we shall issue them during those months in full faith that the expense will be met.

THE TERMS of the Examiner hereafter will be one dollar per year. For five dollars six copies will be given; and for ten dollars thirteen. Having made this arrangement it is thought advisable to withdraw the offer of a "premium" made in the August number. The back numbers for 1848 and '49 will be furnished at the same price as heretofore. All communications and remittances relating to the

Examiner should be directed "GEO. STORRS, Philadelphia, Pa."

THE NEW HYMN BOOK.—We invite the attention of our friends to this work. We believe it to be at least equal to any other: modesty perhaps forbids us to say more; but, we should be glad to have it compared in the matter it contains and its neatness of execution with any other. It is free from sectarianism, and we believe can be used by "all christians." It contains 205 choice Psalms and Hymns, *selected*, but altered and abridged, of such character, we think, as are fitting to be sung in public assemblies. Lighter hymns may be used at other times; and a plenty such can be found in every place without our contributing to multiply them. Several congregations besides ours in Philadelphia have procured our "Christian Psalmody." For price see last page.

MORE ENCOURAGEMENT.

FROM BR. WM. SWINBUE.

PATTERSON, *Sept.* 10, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—Enclosed you will find $2 from Br. Isaac Van Blarcom and myself, to be appropriated for the continuance of the Bible Examiner, to aid you through the present year. We think your valuable paper is worth one dollar a year, and we would prefer giving $2 per annum if the paper could be issued weekly or semi-monthly. We think some six or eight subscribers could be obtained here another year, at $1 monthly or $2 published oftener. Your article in the last number, on the "signs of the times" was rich, and well worth attention. We should like to hear more on the same subject. My own opinion is, that the sons of Judah will not start for the land of their fathers until after the first resurrection. I feel fully satisfied that the battle of the great day has already commenced.

FROM EDWARD TURNER.

BLACKWOODTOWN, N. J., *Sept.* 21, 1849.

MR. STORRS:—*Dear Sir.*—Enclosed I send you $1 to be added to what I paid for the 'Examiner' the present year, being satisfied all the while you were publishing too low by one half or more. I should be sorry not to have the pleasure of reading the 'Examiner,' at even four times its present cost, and think a large majority of your subscribers would be of the same opinion.

I, therefore, would suggest, that you should at once make an estimate of the cost for publishing the 'Examiner,' together with a sufficient sum to pay all labor, expenses, &c. Then make a division of the deficiency amongst your subscribers, and I think there would not be one who would be dissatisfied with the amount extra they would have to pay, and would most gladly do so, rather than have the paper discontinued.

ADDITIONAL DONATIONS since our last to finish the present volume.

Adam Warthman, Philadelphia,	$5.00
C. Thompson, Harrisburg, Pa.,	5.00
A friend in New York City,	3.00
Henry Harris, Free Union, Va.,	1.50
Joseph White, Heath, Mass.,	1.00
J. Simpson, and R. Malone, Richmond, Va.,	5.00
Various other friends.	2.00

IMMORTALITY.

A REVIEW OF REV. LUTHER LEE.

This work is now being stereotyped, and will make about 120 pages. The subject of immortality is philosophically and scripturally discussed. The work discusses the immortality of the soul, the consciousness of the dead, and the destiny of the wicked. It will be ready for delivery about the first of November, at 25 cts. per copy, or five copies for a dollar in paper covers, and mailable. About one half the matter has appeared in the "Bible Examiner," but the remainder *will not* be published in the paper as that course would very much delay the appearance of the book. Persons desirinn the work will please address their orders *immediately* to JOHN T. WALSH, 63 Ogden street, Philadelphia, Pa.

J. T. W.

ALBANY AND UTICA, N. Y.—The Editor of the Examiner designs to spend Lord's day, the 21st inst., in Albany, and remain there till the latter part of that week; then go to Utica to spend Lord's day the 28th, and continue there a few days. He will be glad to meet in either place those who desire to see him.

NOTES ON "ATHANASIA."

No. II.

Mr. Hinton uses Luke 20: 36, "Neither can they die any more," as a positive declaration of the immortality of all men. He makes the question our Lord answers to be one about the "future life," excluding its exclusive application to the resurrection. If so, the text does not prove a resurrection at all on his own principles, elsewhere laid down, that a word cannot have its literal and analogical meaning at the same time. Hence this text is fairly given up by him as proof of the resurrection, the term being used analogically for "future life," [see p. 427.] there may be no resurrection of the dead at all for all this text proves. Again, as the term "die" has an analogical signification, it may be, for all Mr. H. can prove from the text or context, on his theory, used to signify *misery*, or *unhappiness*. Then the text means, "Neither can they be unhappy any more;" and as he supposes he has proved its applicability to all men, or all the human

race, has he not proved all a universalist could desire? Thus all men shall be possessed of a future life—then they cannot be unhappy any more, "but are as the angels of God in heaven;" *Matthew*. This expression of Matthew, Mr. H. endeavors to avoid by saying it does not relate to their moral character or holiness; p. 437. If it has no relation to a resemblance in holiness, it has the appearance of excluding wicked angels from the possession of that which these men possess, or there would have been no need to say angels of God *in heaven*. But Mr. H. says, p. 436, "The point of similarity intended . . . is only that they will 'neither marry nor be given in marriage since they cannot die any more.'" Still we ask—Why contrast good and bad men with the angels *in heaven*? If all men are included, as Mr. H. contends, irrespective of character, why not all angels be the pattern without selecting the good only?

By Adam came death, by Christ came the resurrection from the dead: hence it follows—if the death of Adam was literal, the resurrection is literal; "not die *any more*" refers to a LIKE *death*, and Mr. H. admits die in this text has "the sense of extinction;" p. 479: then the first death must have been "extinction;" for the text plainly has reference to the first death by the words "*any* MORE." Further: if resurrection in this text is to be understood only as a "future life," as Mr. H. contends, and the soul does not die at all with the body, then the phrase neither can they die ANY MORE is without any obvious sense or force; for the words "*any more*" import that those of whom they are spoken had died *once;* but according to Mr. H., their souls had not died at all. Then these words are a *redundance;* and to prove Mr. H.'s view should have been *omitted*. But if they had been, it would still make the expression quite useless; for, it might as well be said of men in THIS *state* they CANNOT DIE, as the *future;* for death cannot touch the soul *now* according to his theory. There would have been much more force in the words, if Mr. H. is correct in his theory, to have predicated that *future existence* itself upon the deathless nature of the soul *now;* but as our Lord did base his argument for a future life on *resurrection*, as is evident from his adding the words "*any more*" to the expression, we are safe in concluding that Mr. H.'s exposition of the text is erroneous. Nor will Mr. H.'s definition of death help him here. Let us look at it. "Death," he says, "in its strict and primary import, signifies nothing more than that condition of an organized substance in which the organic functions have ceased;" p. 38. This then cannot be the death of which our Lord speaks, if Mr. H.'s theory be the true one, for the soul is necessarily spoken of according to him; and yet he admits that our Lord uses the term *die*, in this text in "the sense of *extinction*." Yet, he says, p. 448–9, "A dead man" is "a man in whom the functions of the animal organization are no longer performed . . . but the man still exists . . . nothing has occurred but the stoppage of certain organic functions, entailing a change in the condition, or mode of existence, of the being concerned. This is death," he adds. Such a death surely, Mr. H. will not pretend our Lord spoke of if he was talking of the *future life* before the resurrection, as he maintains; and yet it is most evident our Lord speaks of a like death to one previously experienced, when he adds the words "*any more*." Let us take still another amplification of the meaning of death. Mr. H. says, "In the case of man, the cessation of the animal functions terminates his connection with this world, because it reduces him to a mode of existence to which this world is not adapted; but it involves no cessation of existence in either body or soul:" p. 479. Such a death as this then our Lord did not speak of Lk. 20: 36; for Mr. H. has admitted that the term "*die*," there, is used in "the sense of extinction." In Mr. H.'s expression that the "cessation of the animal functions" in death "involves no cessation of existence in either body or soul," he makes an admission which will put him to the proof that the soul does not become equally unconscious as the body. Thus the body *exists*, though the animal functions have ceased: the soul also *exists*, but where is the evidence of its consciousness?

Again, Mr. H. says, "Death is a change in the mode of human existence, affected by the cessation of the organic functions, but one not interrupting the conscious being of the individual;" p. 136. Then we remark once more, that our Lord could not have been speaking of the future state prior to the resurrection, Lk. 20: 36, when he said "Neither can they die *any more;*" because, if the soul has any *organism*, IT has not died *once*, if Mr. H.'s theory be true; hence, the expression "neither can they die *any more*" is inapplicable to the soul; therefore our Lord was not speaking of a "future state" *prior to the resurrection*. If Mr. H. chooses to take the ground that the soul has no *organism*, it does not help the matter; for that which has no organism is without beginning—is eternal—uncreated; consequently cannot be spoken of as though it was not "*any more*" subject to death, because it never did die, never was subject to death; and hence it would be useless to say neither can it die *any more*. Thus, whatever view we take of the subject, *we* are irresistibly led to the conclusion that our Lord spoke of the dead subsequently to the resurrection, and not prior to it; and therefore our friend Mr. Hinton loses all countenance from this text, that the dead are conscious, though they "exist"—and we readily grant that both soul and body exist after death—and he also fails to establish that all men will live for ever; or, to use his borrowed pagan sentiment, he has failed to prove that "Those who die are immortal, since they will not die any more." From this sentiment we appeal to the Scriptures, and especially to Luke 20, that it is the children of God, in the restricted sense of the phrase, and they only—and that after the resurrection—that cannot die any more, and therefore are immortal. For God calls himself "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," as quoted by our Lord, Lk. 20: 37, we apprehend, in the same sense that Paul uses it when speaking of the faith of ancient worthies, Heb. 11: 16, and says—"Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city." In this connection Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are specially mentioned, and Paul evidently refers to the same passage in Moses' writings as does our Lord in Lk. 20. Here is certain evidence from Paul that God called himself the God of these patriarchs in special reference to their faith and obedience. Did not our Lord assert the same truth? If so, the point is settled that he did not speak of all men. Luke 20.

Mr. Hinton says, p. 425–6, "The question framed

by the Sadducees must, in all propriety, be held to relate generally to the subject of a future life, rather than the fact of the resurrection of the body." And he adds—"This view is not at all inconsistent with either the etymology or the use of the term *anastasis*, which, when it relates to a future state, is by our translators uniformly, but sometimes unhappily, rendered *resurrection*."

We cheerfully admit that "our translators" have "*unhappily*, uniformly rendered *anastasis* resurrection." But "unhappily" for whom? Why, of course, for all who hold that "soul and body both exist" after death, and that the soul has a *conscious* existence. Truly our translators have done an *unhappy* thing for them; and left them no ground for the pagan notion before spoken of, that, "Those who die are immortal, since they will not die any more." That "the question framed by the Sadducees must be held to relate to the subject of a future life" BY A RESURRECTION *from the dead*, we trust is now sufficiently manifest; yet, lastly, we call attention to *the fact* that the question of the Sadducees expressly binds down the "*future life*" about which they inquired to the resurrection state. The question is thus stated by Mark 12: 23. "In the resurrection, therefore, WHEN THEY SHALL RISE, whose wife shall she be of them?" Now, if Mr. Hinton's theory be correct, this language certainly does not favor it; and of this it seems he must have been aware, as he takes no notice of it.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES—NO. III.

"THE BATTLE OF THAT GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY."

It will be our object in this article to bring together the points in Revelation relating to that battle, with some remarks upon the events introduced. The first place where it is alluded to is in chap. 11, under the sounding of the seventh trumpet. That trumpet in our opinion commenced about 1789, at that convulsion in France which was followed by the career of Napoleon Bonaparte, and has continued to the present time. It contained the seven last plagues, which constituted it a "woe" trumpet. The last verse of the 11th chapter has these words, under this trumpet—"*The temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament:* and there were lightenings, and voices and thunderings, and an earthquake, and a great hail." This subject though interrupted by the three following chapters, is resumed distinctly in the 15th chapter 5th verse, in these words, which show the connection.—"I looked, and behold, *the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened.*" Then the seven angels are seen coming "out of the temple, having the seven last plagues," &c. These plagues were to "fill up the wrath of God" on the anti-christian powers; or, to "destroy them which destroy [corrupt] the earth," or land: that is, the inhabitants of those countries where the anti-christian powers, now to be destroyed, had carried on their abominations. Under the seventh trumpet, and during the time of the pouring out of the seven vials, "*the nations were* ANGRY." This we regard as the first intimation of the battle of the great day. The next direct presentation of it is in chapter 16: 13—16, or the work of the unclean spirits which go forth to gather the kings of the earth to the battle; and it is said they are gathered together to a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. Here we may as well remark on the *place* before we pass to the other connecting points in the prophecy.

"Armageddon"—the mountain of Mageddon; or Mageddo, a city situated in a great plain at the foot of mount Carmel. Here king Josiah was slain in battle, (see 2 Chron. 35: 22—25:) here Barak and Deborah overcame Sisera and his great army, (Judges 5: 19.) It was a noted place for scenes of carnage; and hence is used, Rev. 16, *symbolically* for the place of the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Europe and western Asia have been the places where the blood of Jews and Christians has been shed like water. Europe especially has been the Papal slaughter-house Europe then is *the place* symbolized by Armageddon—that is the valley of slaughter and judgment.

Having now connected two points concerning this battle, as presented in chapters 11 and 16, we are again interrupted by a view of the judgment of the great whore on the scarlet colored beast; but in that description, chap. 17, we are once more presented with some of the elements that go to make up the army of anti-Christ; *viz.*, The ten horns—or kingdoms under Papal influence—which give their power and strength unto the beast, or papal civil power for a time; "These," all combined, "shall make war on the Lamb," &c., v. 14. Then our direct view of the battle is again interrupted by a presentation in a separate form of the judgment of Babylon, or the great whore, and with the joy that arises to the holy ones at her fall. Passing all this we come once more to an open view of the gathering and battle field with its result.

The scene opens at chap. 19: 11, and continues to chap. 20: 3. The whole is a symbolical representation. Let none forget this fact. From verse 11 to 15, is a representation of "The Word of God;" or, in other words, Christ. We have in a previous article expressed the belief that the armies opposed to Christ do not actually see him, or know that they are really fighting against him. Here we call attention again to chapter 16, where it is expressly said—"Behold I come as *a thief*." Come to what? Evidently, to the battle of that great day. Look at that text again in its connection. A description is given of the working of the unclean spirits, preparing the kings of the earth for that conflict. At this point the language, "behold I come as a thief," &c. is uttered; showing that it is something connected with the battle, and is accompanied by a caution to saints not to be drawn into the corrupting influences which will be everywhere in operation to turn off men's minds from a constant preparation for the final result. They are to keep their garments—keep far removed from the *war* spirit that will go forth from nation to nation, so that whoever shall allow themselves to fall into its current will become defiled and be stript of those garments of meekness which characterise a christian; and thus stript, his shame will appear; because he will be manifested to be destitute of the peaceable spirit of Christ, and thus demonstrated not to belong to him. "Blessed is he that *watcheth* and keepeth his garments" pure from the spirit of war, and the love of the world.

We now ask, how does a *thief come*? Not openly, but secretly; unseen and unsuspected by

those who are to be the victims visited. So Christ will come to that battle, and cause these angry nations to be gathered to the terrible conflict which is to result in their overthrow and ruin. "In righteousness does he judge and make war." These anti-christian powers have "made war on the saints" and on the truth for centuries; and done it in a most unrighteous manner: but the Lamb, now "King of kings," maketh war on them in righteousness, and in just judgment for their violence to his truth and his people. He now "treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God;" a full description of which had been prophecied of in Isa. 63: 1 to 6, and now the time has come; but Christ comes to it as a thief—unseen—unknown by his enemies, while they will be made the instruments one upon another of executing the wrath. We may illustrate this secret presence of Christ in this battle by the case recorded in 2 Kings, 6: 15—17. The king of Syria had sent an army to seize Elisha the prophet. They came, "horses and chariots, and a great host, by night and encompassed the city about. And when the servant of the man of God was risen early, and gone forth, behold, an host compasssed the city, both with horses and chariots: and his servent said unto him, alas, my master! how shall we do? And he answered, fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man: and he saw, and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha."

Here we see a great army from heaven, "even more for" Elisha than they were against him; but they were there "as a thief"—invisible to the opposing army—exerting an invincible power which made the victory sure. Thus we apprehend it will be in the battle of that great day. Christ, with "the armies of heaven" will be there, though invisible; but the war so far as physical power is brought into the conflict, will be that of the hand of every man "against his neighbor;" or, one nation will be the instrument in executing judgment against another; and so in turn destroying each other. The scenery of calling the fowls of heaven to "the supper of the great God" indicates the greatness of the slaughter of that awful period. Then the fact is stated of the actual gathering of the kings of the earth and their armies to make war against Christ and his army. Next the "beast was taken;" by which we understand the scarlet colored beast, which we regard also as the "*image* to the beast which had the wound by the sword," chap. 13; being as we have said in a previous article, only another aspect of the same beast; or, the aspect given it a short time before it goes "into perdition;" and *with him* is taken "the false prophet which wrought miracles" or wonders—"before"—or in the presence of—the beast.

Before proceeding, it will be necessary to inquire, what power is symbolized by the false prophet? A false prophet is one who speaks in the name of the Lord when God has not commissioned him; see Deut. 18: 20-22. The character of a false prophet is accurately described in Acts 13th chap, in the case of "Elymas the sorcerer." He is "full of all subtlety"—withstands the truth—seeks to turn men from the truth—full of all mischief—an enemy to all righteousness—a perverter of the right ways of the Lord, consequently a "child of the devil." See Acts 13: 6—10. This power corresponds well to the "two horned beast," Rev. 13: 11—18. We regard this two horned beast and the false prophet as identically the same power under two aspects. They both wrought miracles or wonders, before the beast. We are of the opinion that the Pope and Cardinals in the exercise of civil power are, or constitute the beast with its two horns like a lamb—a mild, Christ-like power by profession, but speaking with its mouth like a dragon. The time was when the clergy generally had a voice in the choice of the Popes, and the emperors confirmed the choice; but some where in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries the Cardinals assumed the sole power to elect and constitute the Pope, and have held that power to the present time, or over 600 years, how near "666" we do not know. This *dragon-lamb*—this Pope and Cardinal beast, has "exercised all the power of the beast before him;" and has had all the characteristics of the false prophet described Acts 13th. This power, we think, is the false prophet taken *with* the beast, in "the battle of that great day of God Almighty," and "these both are cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone," corresponding with "eating her flesh and burning her with fire," chap. 17, and denotes their utter and irrevokable destruction, so that they shall never recover; it is a final overthrow of that anti-Christian power with all its abominable delusions and superstitions; and then it follows that "the remnant," viz. "the kings of the earth," &c., "were slain with the sword," &c. These were made instruments, first, through hatred to the whore, of destroying her with all her appendages, and then are the sword, or agents in one another's destruction, till both the Papal power is ruined, and those nations overthrown, and their governments destroyed, who had been corrupted by her sorceries and abominations.

Having thus briefly noticed the fate of some of the powers engaged in the battle of that day, we must not pass by an other power concerned in the same conflict. This is liable to be done by separating the 19th and 20th chapters, which should be regarded as inseparable. The *dragon* power is most assuredly engaged in that war, though not mentioned in chap. 19; yet the 16th chap. clearly shows the dragon as a principal actor in the scenes of that day. It was out of his mouth one of the unclean spirits came that was to gather to the battle. We may depend, therefore, that that power will not be overlooked. The account of the battle in Rev. 19th should be read to the close of the 3d verse of the 20th chap. without interruption; thus we shall get the fate of all the powers engaged in the conflict.

We are now, then, to inquire what power is symbolized by the *Dragon;* after which we will notice its fate. In introducing this power, chap. 20, it is called "The Dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan." The whole description here we consider symbolical; and not designed at all to represent a personal being usually denominated "*the devil.*" This remark, however, is not to be construed into a denial of the existence of such a personal being: we only say, that in *this text* he is not the power spoken of. Dr. EADIE, in his Biblical Cyclopedia, a new English work, on the word "*Dragon,*" says: "In the Apocalypse it

seems to be a symbol of the *dark, malignant spirit of Evil*, either in himself or in those human influences which he inspires or employs." On the "*serpent*," the same author remarks: "In Egypt and other nations the *serpent* was a common symbol of *power*. Idolators regarded it as a *personification of all evil*." KITTO, in his "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature," another English work of great merit and reputation, says: "They anciently represented all great destructive agents under the form of a *Dragon*, or *monster serpent*." He further remarks that there were temples built to Dragons, some of which were several miles in length, and built in a serpentine form.

As a sign of *power*, Moses seems to have used it when sent to Pharaoh; see Exodus 7: 9, where the Lord told Moses his rod should become a serpent—a *dragon*—before Pharoah. The word here translated serpent is the same that is rendered *dragon*. Isa. 27: 1. It was the *sign* of Moses' *power*, received from God, to deliver Israel. The words devil and satan are the Greek and Hebrew words expressing the same thing; and literally signify "*adversary*," leaving the connection to determine what particular adversary is spoken of. The expression, "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan," therefore, signifies *a dark, malignant power*, which is to act a prominent part in the transactions of "that great day of God Almighty;" and which is to be the last disposed of in the conflict, and is not to be utterly destroyed at that time, but reserved for another period, hereafter to be spoken of. The question now returns—*What power is it?* We have said that the symbols by which it is represented only signify a malignant and destructive power. We now add, that we are not to suppose, because we find these symbols employed in regard to one destructive power, that that is the power always intended. If this were the case, we should have to confine its application wholly to the Imperial power of Egypt; for, in Ezekiel 29, the Lord expressly calls "Pharoah king of Egypt, the *great dragon*." This passage goes to confirm the position that it is a symbol to denote an extraordinarily malignant or destructive power, and a power too that has specially been an oppressor of Jacob's posterity. Such was the Imperial power of Egypt; such was the Imperial power of Rome, and hence symbolized by a dragon, Rev. 12th; but in Rev. 16th and 20th we have come to a period where the symbol cannot apply to Rome Imperial, nor to Rome Papal; the latter is described by other symbols, and the former had passed away. The Dragon, then, in chapters 16 and 20 is another power. To find this power, we shall again have to revert to the prophecies of the old Testament; we shall there find more in detail, a description of a part of this same battle of the great day of God. We turn then to Ezekiel 38 and 39. Let us examine some of the powers here introduced.

The 38th chapter commences thus—"Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of [*Rosh*] Mesheck and Tubal." We have inserted "*Rosh*" on the authority of the Septuagint. The 6th verse speaks of "Gomer, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the *north* quarters," &c. These powers are among those that are found in the conflict described in that prophecy. These are all descendants of Japheth, as may be learned from Genesis 10: 1—5. They peopled Asia Minor and nearly all *Europe*; called "The isle of the Gentiles," in the time of Moses: see Gen. 10: 5. "Gog," then, is to be found some where in Europe, and the Septuagint gives us the clue to the power intended, *viz.* "*Rosh*," or RUSSIA. Gog was in ancient times the name of *the king* of the northern country, as Pharoah was the common name of the kings of Egypt. Hence Gog is the name of a *Dynasty* of kings or emperors; and, if the Septuagint can be relied upon, it seems it is the Russian Dynasty. Russia has been a great oppressor of the Jews, and is still their greatest scourge; and, in this respect, is entitled to the appellation of "*the great Dragon*." Whether that power is literally to invade the land of Israel, as indicated, Ezk. 38 and 39, or whether the scenery is laid there only because the legal inheritors of that land are the subjects of Gog's malignant operations, we need not now decide—time will soon determine that point—but that Gog, the chief prince of Rosh, or Russia, is one of the most active and malignant powers engaged in the terrible conflict immediately to precede the establishment of the reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, is clearly evident. It is not our design now to give an exposition of this prophecy in Ezekiel, but only to introduce it so far as to identify the power with that denominated the Dragon, Rev. 16 and 20. In further confirmation of this view, we have in Rev. 20, the fact that when this power is loosed at the end of the 1000 years, the same powers are introduced into the scene as in Ezekiel, viz. "Gog and Magog." We are led, then, to the conclusion that the Dynasty of Russian Emperors is symbolized by "the Dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan." The Russian Imperial power began to assume its present importance and form under Peter the Great, in the commencement of the last century. It has steadily marched on to its present greatness, and its dark, malignant character; and most unquestionably has a part to act in the battle of the great day of God Almighty, which is not to be passed over under the general name of "the kings of the earth"—*tees gees*—of *the land*, or Roman Catholic earth, or territory where that Romish power had held sway. Russia is not, and never was, of that land; but is, and always has been, a separate and distinct power, and also is of the Greek religion, which is hostile to the Papal authority and religion. The difference between the two religious systems may be seen by consulting the "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," but we have not space to note it now.

If we are correct, then, in fixing upon the Russian Imperial power as the Dragon power, we are now prepared to contemplate its fate. The other powers, let it be remembered, are utterly destroyed in the battle; and the symbols employed denote a destruction from which there is no revival—their destruction as organized powers is *final*. Not so with the Dragon power; and this forms a sufficient reason for introducing its fate in a distant scene as found at the commencement of chap. 20. An angel is represented as coming down from heaven. By this expression, however, we are to understand nothing more than that the angel is a symbol of the agency that God shall choose to employ in accomplishing the work to be done. It is quite useless to speculate as to what agency precisely it is, that is symbolized by the angel, or that God will employ—time alone can certainly determine that. This

power is represented as being commissioned to bind and imprison the dragon—that is, to cut off and curtail his power so that it can perform no organised work of evil for a specified period: but the dragon is not to be *destroyed* now as the other powers are; and it will have a revival, after which comes its final doom.

The work now to be accomplished is represented by symbols easy to be understood. The dragon is *bound—i. e.* deprived of all *his power;* then he is *shut up; i. e.* kept securely: in the "bottomless pit"—*abusson.* This Greek word occurs only twice out of Revelation, and seven times in that book. It may be proper here to inquire as to the meaning of it. One thing is certain, it never means *hell,* in in the popular sense of that term. The first place where it occurs is in Lk. 8: 31; and is there translated "*the deep.*" Dr. Eadie, on this word, in his Cyclopedia, says—"Rendered in our version sometimes DEEP, and uniformly BOTTOMLESS PIT, either by itself or in connection with another term, in the book of Revelation. A deep without a bottom—a very deep pit, referring often to that vast body of water which in Jewish opinion was laid up in some carvernous receptacle within the earth. It refers sometimes to the dark sepulchres of the east, which, hewn out in the rock, and descending far beneath the surface, formed a kind of under world. In the Apocalypse, it symbolises the abode and the doom of those powers which are hostile to Christ and his Church."

This definition may help us in further examining this point. In Rom. 10: 7, Paul uses the word thus, in speaking of our Lord—"Who shall descend into the deep"—*abusson?* "That is," says the apostle, "to bring up Christ again from *the dead.*" Here the word is used for the sepulchre—the tomb—the state of the dead. The other places where it occurs are in Rev. 9: 1, 2, 11; and 11: 17; and 17: 8; and 20: 1, 2. In the last place, which we are at this time considering, it is used to indicate, that as in a state of death a man is deprived of all power to accomplish anything, so the Dragon should be placed in such circumstances that he can accomplish nothing against those who had previously suffered from his malignity; and the world, under the reign of Christ and his associates in government, will remain unmolested till the end of the period specified; after which the Dragon power will revive for a short period, and then share the same fate that the beast and false prophet had done at the battle of the great day; which is symbolized by being cast into the lake of fire, and being tormented day and night for ever and ever; which language implies no more than the awful nature of the destruction of that power, and the perpetuity of its overthrow. Whether there be a personal devil, yea or nay, this text and context has nothing to do with his final destiny. It is an anti-Christian organism, national in its character, whose fate is here brought to view. In another article we may say more of the signs that "the battle of that great day of God Almighty" is now going on.

RESPONSE TO B. B. JACKMAN.

BR. STORRS.—I noticed in the Examiner of July an answer from B. B. Jackman to my question in the number for May. As it is clearly seen that he has failed to prove when and how Christ is to accomplish the great object of his coming into the world, that is to destroy the devil and his works, I consider the question unanswered.

Friend Jackman, according to his article, believes that devils and sinners, or they that are filthy, will exist in a conscious state as long as God exists. Now he will not deny but that as long as these beings exist, the works of the devil remain also. He may say that the devil would be destroyed if confined. But, would that destroy his works while sinners were eternally sinning? Certainly not. John the Baptist speaks thus concerning the workers of iniquity, Mat. 3: 12, "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into his garner, but the chaff (filth) he will burn *up* with unquenchable fire." And St. John says, 1 John 3: 8, "For this cause the Son of God was made manifest that he might destroy the works of the devil."

He also speaks of the meaning of the words eternal and everlasting, and seems to believe that they are to be understood strictly literal throughout the bible; but if he will turn to Gen. 17: 8, and chap. 49: 26, he will find there, and in other places, that they are applied to things that have an end: and to make it still plainer to his mind you will please send him a copy of your Six Sermons, and charge to my accoun'; which I think he will gladly and with much profit peruse. Yours for the truth,

E. W. KNIGHT.

ON THE COMING OF THE LORD.—Too little, alas! are we affected by the anticipation of the glorious appearing of our Redeemer and of our participation in that glory. Where is the praise, the gratitude, the joy, the holiness, that this anticipation ought to inspire?

Where the grateful praise to our Father for his wondrous love to sinners who deserved everlasting destruction, in making us "joint-heirs" with his best beloved Son to such an inheritance? Expecting soon the thrilling welcome to enter through the gates into the city, how should the incense of praise to the Rock of our Salvation ascend perpetually from the altar of our hearts! Hoping so soon to enter into the joy of our Lord; to see him as he is and be like him forever; why are our acknowledgements of obligation to him who has loved us and given himself for us, so cold and infrequent?

Where is the joy which the assurance of awaking from the dust, in the perfect image of our Saviour, to reign with him in the everlasting kingdom, is so well adapted to excite? Do not the felicities of the Holy City eclipse all the glory of this present world? Why then are we so much affected by the things which are seen and temporal and so little enraptured by those which are eternal? Can we not reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us? Why then are we so cast down in the hour of affliction and adversity? Why do we not rejoice in tribulation also?

Where is the holiness; the victory over the carnal influences of this world, and the powerful examples of holy living becoming the candinates for immortality in the presence of God and the Lamb? "What manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness" who expect soon to inhabit the city where nothing that defileth can enter?

H. GREW.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

Christ's cross is the sweetest burden that ever I bare; it is such a burden as wings are to a bird, or sails to a ship, to carry me forward to my harbor.

Hold fast Christ, but take his cross and himself cheerfully; Christ and his cross are not separable in this life, however they part at Heaven's door.

To be crucified to the world is not so highly accounted of by us as it should be; how heavenly a thing it is to be deaf and dead to this world's sweetest music!

Make others to see Christ in you, moving, doing, speaking and thinking; your actions will speak of him, if he be in you.

Go where you will, your soul will find no rest but in Christ's bosom: Inquire for him, come to him, and rest you on Christ the Son of God; I sought him, and I found in him all I can wish or want.

Lose not sight of Christ in this cloudy and dark day; learn not from the world to serve Christ, but ask himself the way; the world is a false copy, and a deceitful guide to follow.

All come not home at night who suppose they have set their faces heaven-ward: it is a woful thing to die, and miss heaven; how many a mere professor's candle is blown out, and never lighted again. Many, now, take Christ by guess; therefore, I say, be sure you take Christ himself; his sweet working in the soul will not lie, it will soon tell whether it be Christ indeed whom you have met with.

The day of the Lord is at hand, when all men shall appear as they are: there shall be no borrowed colors in that day; men borrow the lustre of Christianity, but how many counterfeit masks will be burned in the day of God.

I wish our thoughts were, more frequently than they are, upon our country! heaven casteth a sweet perfume afar off to those who have spiritual senses.

Go on in the strength of the Lord, and put Christ's love to the trial, and put upon it burdens, and then it will appear love indeed; we employ not his love, and therefore we know it not.

More I can neither wish, nor pray, nor desire for you than Christ, singled and chosen out from all things, even though wearing a crown of thorns. I am sure the saints are at best but strangers to the weight and worth of the incomparable excellence of Christ. We know not half of what we love when we love Christ.

I would not have believed that there is so much in Jesus as there is. It is little to see him in a book; but to draw nigh to Christ is another thing.

That Christ and a sinner should be one, and share heaven between them, is the wonder of salvation; what more could love do?—*Rutherford's Letters.*

SINNERS AND THE ATONEMENT.

We find the sermon preached by Rev. B. I. Lane, of Cambridge, before the Massachusetts Conference of Baptist Ministers, in the Evangelical preacher. It deserves well the place it there occupies. Though we gave at the time an outline of this discourse, the following extract on pointing sinners to the atonement, will interest the reader.—*Reflector.*

Threatening may awaken fear and force submission, but it cannot beget love—it cannot reconcile the heart to that from which it has been estranged. It is not in its nature to do so. We repeat, that we are not speaking against alarming the sinner, and pointing him to the coming wrath. It is important that we do so. The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, and the final judgment, together with other great truths, must be often and carefully insisted upon. But we must go further. And, the point on which we are insisting, does not, it appears to us, hold that prominent place in the ministry of most preachers, that it does in the Bible. It may be coldly stated, and a few passages of scripture in relation to it indifferently repeated; but it is not earnestly and affectingly dwelt upon in its place. When the sinner stands trembling upon the brink of wo, when he is appalled in view of the fearful miseries that await the wicked, it is not the time to point him to Sinai's lightning, or to a burning hell; but the love and compassion of God in the atonement should be exhibited, as the arm of God stretched over the pit of ruin to catch the helpless penitent. This is the top-stone of the spiritual temple, 'brought forth with shouting, crying grace! grace unto it!' This truth, clearly stated, understood and embraced, will complete the work of truth, and reconcile the sinner to God. He may be awakened, he may be convicted, but he will not, he cannot be converted—the affections of his heart cannot be won to the love of God by any other means than the melting tenderness of the gospel. 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;' this is the word of reconciliation committed to us. In this word, illustrated and enforced in ten thousand ways, we have the grand instrument of genuine *revivals.* With this word, you may successfully assail the citadel of the 'strong man armed.'

When, my brethren, everything else fails to change the affections of sinners, and bring them to a cordial love and obedience of the gospel; when the ordinance of reason fails to make an impression; when the weapons of terror fall upon sinners' hearts as pebbles upon the shield of Achilles; when the battery of a coming wrath fails to bring one sinner upon his face, then, in 'burning thought and breathing words, 'charge upon them from the humiliation of Bethlehem, the groans of Gethsemane and the deeper agonies of Calvary. Let

It come over their ears like the sweet breath of heaven,
That breathes upon the flowers of Paradise,
Gathering and giving odor,

that 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespesses unto them,' and you shall presently see the mighty effect of it in the inquiry, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

LETTERS.

From Dr. Field.

Jeffersonville, Ind., Sept. 6, 1849.

Br. Storrs:—I have had a desire for some time to hear from you, but have had so little time for writing, that I have hitherto neglected to open a correspondence with you. If you are publishing a paper I wish to become a subscriber, and would be glad to have one of your books containing your Six Sermons, and some small essays on immortality.

Would it be possible to induce you to come west

on a missionary tour, and spend some time with me? I am exceedingly anxious to have the aid and co-operation of brethren who hold my views. Perhaps you know that I have been forced to constitute a new church here, on free and independent principles, which has been in existence now two years, and is in a prosperous condition. We number about one hundred. What say you to a tour West? If you cannot come, can you send a young man of good talents and character, to aid me in my labors? I need assistance very much. A preacher or two West, of bold and persevering character, could be sustained.

Yours, in the hope of immortality,
N. FIELD.

If the Lord permit, we will endeavor to visit you and others, in the West, before many months. It has been on our mind to do so, if health and pecuniary circumstances would allow. We hope to answer the calls of old friends there before long.—ED. EX.

—

FROM BR. WILLIAM ONGLEY.

TOWN OF THORALD, C. W. Sept. 22, 1849.

DEAR BR. STORRS:—My wife joins with me in love to you and your family, praying the God of all grace to keep and preserve you all in perfect peace and blameless, unto his coming kingdom; we hope you will be made a blessing in preaching the *word* to the people in these last days. The subject of Life and Death, it seems to me, is the last truth to stir up the people; *get them to see this*, and they are ready to hear on the second advent of our Lord, and other Bible truths. It appears to me it was the first preached to Adam in the garden, by God himself, and it will be the last, connected with other truths. Myself and wife are holding meetings in Canada West, for the present, and are expecting our King before 1850 runs out. I suppose you think we shall be disappointed; if we should, we will continue to wait, but with earnest expectation, and would say come, Lord Jesus, and come quickly. Amen.

I remain yours, waiting for eternal life, when Jesus comes, to change these mortal bodies, and make them like unto his most glorious body.

—

FROM BR. ANSON WALKER.

NEW YORK, Oct. 1849.

BR. STORRS:—I read the welcome Examiner with interest and profit; and was pained to learn that there was any probability that it might be discontinued. I need not express my satisfaction as to its spirit, and the "exceeding great and precious promises" and blessings it is bringing to light from the darkness of sectarianism, together with the fearless and able manner they are set forth and defended; and it must, I think, carry conviction to every unprejudiced mind who will carefully read it. What but the spreading power and force of truth, the glory and consistency of the doctrines advocated in the Examiner, and their influence on the minds of men, has called out the True Wesleyan into the field against you? Others, less capable than the Editor of the Wesleyan, and more firmly bound in sectarianism, seem unwilling to lend a helping hand to sustain the downward tendency of immortal-soulism, but seem to choose to let it quietly wreck, as the "orthodox" of England have done, by assuming that immortal does not mean "*positively shall* live forever." From what I see here, I judge that the arguments of the Examiner are too conclusive to allow of many venturing into the field against you, lest they meet the fate of others who have made the trial; for surely the Examiner is conducted with ability enough to merit the attention of wise men.

TRIALS OF THE WORLD.

"This world is full of suffering; along the mournful air
The notes of sad complaining are ringing every where.
Love shieldeth not its idols from death's unsparing darts,
And the whole wide earth is teeming with crushed and broken hearts.
Yet were no clouds of sorrow along our pathway driven,
This world would be a Paradise we scarce would change for Heaven.
"This life is full of trial, yet we know that One above
Looks ever down upon us with a sympathizing love,
And pitieth our infirmities, though others may deride,
For the heart hath not a sorrow with which *He* was not tried.
Oh let us then be patient, be meek and murmur not,
Though clouds and gloom and shadows surround our earthly lot,
And when the heart repineth, think of that Holy One
Who meekly bore and suffered to win for us a crown.
Then let us place the anchor of our confidence and trust
On the might of the Creator, the Omnipotent and Just,
Whose will we may not question, nor His hidden motives tell,
Yet rest in His assurance that 'He doeth all things well.'"

BUSINESS NOTICES.—Wm. Ongley. Money received.
Thos. C. Crane. Hymn Books sent according to order.
Henry Harris. Dobney and Hymn Books sent as you directed.

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in

BOSTON, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 87 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store.

ALBANY, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, No. 344 Broadway, and H. R Holmes, 16 S. Pearl St.

NEW YORK CITY, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., of Ransom Hicks, No. 215 Pine St.

HARTFORD, Conn., of Dr. D. Crary, and Eld. J. S. White.

Our "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh, Geo. T. Adams, Dr. Burdell, Dr. Crary, Eld. White, and Ransom Hicks.

PRICE OF BOOKS, ETC., AT THE EXAMINER OFFICE.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, (New Hymn Book,) 128 pages, 24mo., paper covers, 15 cts. each; ten copies for $1.00; for $8.00, one hundred copies.

SIX SERMONS, Quarto, 16 pages, (newspaper postage, only, when sent by mail,) $1.00 per forty copies. No further discount can be made on either of the above works.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, bound, *seventy five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifty*.

SIX SERMONS, 18mo., 120 pages, bound, *twenty-five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifteen*.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, bound in plain morocco, *twenty-five* cts.

On the three last named works *one-third* discount will be made to those who buy to sell again: and we will make a still further discount of *twenty per cent.* to those who send us twenty dollars, current money, at one time. This offer is designed to enable those who may wish it, to keep a depository of these works, and to cover their expense for transportation. The names of such we will place in the list of depositories, in the Examiner.

☞We cannot make the "twenty per cent" discount unless our terms are strictly complied with; as we are subjected to an additional charge to our printer if we have credit for his work; and a less sum than $20 would not help us much in obtaining discount with him.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1849. No. 11.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

FUTURE STATES.

BY REV. REGINALD COURTNEY, A. M.

(Continued from page 102.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

St. Paul's declaration that "we are come to the New Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, and to the *spirits of just men made perfect*," has sometimes been held to indicate an intermediate consciousness. Thus Dr. Watts argues in his "World to Come." "The Gospel or the Christian state brings good men into a nearer union and communion with the heavenly world and the inhabitants thereof, than the Jewish state could do. The inhabitants of this upper world, this heavenly Jerusalem, are here reckoned up: God as the prime Lord or Head; Jesus the Mediator as the King of his Church; the innumerable company of angels as ministers of his kingdom; the general assembly of God's favorites or children, who are called the first-born;—which may perhaps refer in general to all the saints of all ages past, and to come, whose names are written in the Book of Life in heaven; and particularly to the spirits of just men who are departed from this world, and are made perfect in the heavenly state. * * * It has been objected," continues Dr. Watts, "that the spirits of the just are *not yet* made perfect in heaven, because the apostle says, 'These all,' *i. e.* the saints of the Old Testament, 'having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises; God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.' Now these had been dead for many generations, yet they received not the promises, nor were made perfect. Thus saith the objection. But the evident meaning is, that they lived and died in the faith of many promises, some of which were to be fulfilled, after their days, here on earth, but were not fulfilled *in their lifetime:* they did not enjoy Gospel blessings in that perfect manner in which we do since the Messiah has come, and, by offering himself, 'perfected for ever them that are satisfied.'"

In the sense which Dr. Watts has here given to the word, just men now on earth are as truly "perfected" as those spirits which he imagines to be so in an intermediate state. When it is said that they who are sanctified are "perfected," it is plainly meant that (though they are still required to go on unto a further "perfection,") yet in as far as their redemption depends on, or rather *consists in*, the shedding of the blood of Christ, it is a work perfectly accomplished. But in general they are said to be "perfected," who have received their "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory;" who have obtained *all* that God has promised to bestow. In this sense, as the context proves, the spirits of the just will be found to be perfected, when we, who are now emulating them on earth, are admitted, at the Last Day, into their joyful society. For the *promises*, which they are not to receive without us, are as yet future; are *not* to be realised, as Dr. Watts maintains, either on earth, by those who live under the gospel dispensation, or by disembodied spirits in the intermediate state; but by the saints of the old, not without those of the new dispensation, in heaven itself, after the Great Judgement-day. For St. Paul is plainly referring to that *rest*, (in the heavenly Canaan, the New Jerusalem,) which yet "*remaineth for* the people of God;" a rest, promised to the Jews, but to them in common with the whole Christian community of believing children of Abraham. In this view he says, shortly after, "Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the *promise*. For yet a little while, and *he that shall come will come*, and will not tarry." We then who are now living by faith, under the Gospel dispensation, have not received the promises, nor are as yet made perfect, nor shall be perfected until Christ comes.

It is indeed *abundantly* plain that the "promises" spoken of in the epistle to the Hebrews are all to be realized at the resurrection. The thing promised is "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And this city does *not* mean, as Dr. Watts supposes, that Christian Church, or that Gospel dispensation, which was established by the Messiah at his first advent. For they who died in faith, not having received the promises, sought (not merely spiritual privileges such as might be enjoyed in common by just men made perfect in earth, with just men made perfect in heaven, but) emphatically, a "*heavenly* country." Their hope was "to obtain a happy *resurrection*:" to enter and enjoy "a kingdom which cannot be moved" *after* the removal of the present heavens and earth. Here they had not, nor have we, any continuing city; but we are still to seek, even as they sought, one which is "*to come*."

In the same view said St. Paul, I sacrifice all things, "if by any means I might attain unto *the ressurrection of the dead*. Not as though I had already attained, either were already *perfected*:" But he pressed forward, that he might obtain the prize, even that crown of righteousness which the Last day should bring him.

We are come to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to the other concomitant blessings, in this

sense—that we are invited now to realise faith by and hope, as far as we may, the blessedness to be experienced in the future world. Even now we are to act as if in the visible presence of our Judge, and of the myriads of attendant angels; as if the heavenly Jerusalem had already come down from God; as if in the society of all those blessed spirits who shall by regeneration receive their perfect consummation and bliss. In the same sense also are we come to Jesus the Mediator, and to the blood of sprinkling. The benefits of his mediation and atonement are as yet received by us only in part, as far as we may receive them by faith and hope; for we have not yet obtained our promised joint inheritance; our "crown of *righteousness*" is as yet laid up; our "kingdom that cannot be moved" still awaits the promised shaking of the earth.

It is remarkable that St. Paul mentions both the church of the first-born, and the spirits of the just made perfect. He appears to be viewing the same persons under two conditions, first, as members of the invisible church *on earth** in all ages; and secondly, as perfected in heaven. To the former we are already come in part; our communion with the latter is reserved for another world.

"To this end," says St. Paul, "Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Hence Calvin argues, that the dead must be in a state of consciousness; —"for he cannot be Lord except of those who are in being." But God is not the God of the dead; and St. Paul's words point rather to the resurrection. Christ is Lord of the dead, just as He is Lord of Death. He has the keys of Hades and Death, but has *not yet* unlocked their dark gates, nor disenthralled the souls in bondage to their power. "All power is given unto Him in heaven and earth;" but He has not yet "taken unto Himself His great power and reigned." We must not judge our brethren, says the apostle; seeing that we are to live and die unto the Lord alone, before whose judgment seat both quick and dead shall stand.

"A testimony against them [who hold the sleep of the soul] is borne," says Calvin, "in heaven, before God and His angels, by the souls of the martyrs, who with a loud voice cry from under the altar, 'How long, O Lord, dost Thou not avenge our blood on the inhabitants of the earth. And white robes were given unto them; and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren that should be killed as they were, were fulfilled.' What, O slumbering spirits, are white robes to you? Are they cushions on which you may repose in sleep? The white robes suit not sleep. They must needs be awake who are clothed thus. Doubtless the white robes signify the commencement of that glory which Divine Goodness confers on the martyrs, while they await the judgment-day."

Probably Calvin is perfectly right in this. And these martyrs are the same with "those that came out of great tribulation, and had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; and the same as "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God; * * who sat on thrones, and had judgment given unto them, and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." And Calvin is probably correct also in his opinion, that St. John "sets forth a twofold resurrection; one of the soul, before judgment, the other when the body is raised." For it is expressly said that "*the souls* of them which were beheaded, etc, *lived* and reigned with Christ;" and that "the *rest of the dead*" (*souls* surely?) "*lived not* until the thousand years were finished." And what is a resurrection of the soul before judgment, or a soul's living with Christ while the rest of the dead *live not*, but a restoration to life and consciousness?

Some have maintained that "the first resurrection" is corporeal: but even admitting this, it cannot be admitted, that when souls are said to live, it is meant that *bodies only* are restored to life, and that the souls were alive before: and also that, when it is said, "the rest of the dead lived not," *corpses only* are intended. But in order to obtain from the above passages a proof of intermediate consciousness, continuing from the time of death, we must further believe that the first resurrection includes *all* the dead, who die in the Lord: whereas the Scripture speaks of martyrs alone.* *They* will live, i. e. their souls will live for a thousand years before the rest of the dead are restored to life: but there is no ground for supposing that the souls and *bodies* of *all* the redeemed will enjoy a millennial reign; supervening upon an indefinite period of hopeful consciousness. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this *the judgment*; —not two protracted states of intermediate life. The martyrs indeed shall be in a state to cry unto God, and receive white robes, *for a little season before* that judgment on their persecutors; on which, as it appears, the millenial reign of Christ shall ensue. But we need not expand this little season even in their case, much less that of others, into untold thousands of years.

Strange it is, seeing that death and judgment are in Scripture brought so near each other, that there are many who have familiarized their minds to the belief that two states must be passed through, and each of great length, before the deceased Christian encounters the final judgment seat, to "receive the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad." Many expect to be in great bliss and glory, emancipated from the bondage of the flesh, and with Christ, immediately on their departure from this world; and hope to exchange this wholly spiritual state for a Millennial reign with Christ upon the present earth, before the second resurrection. And this their millennial state, in which the body is, as they suppose, re-united to the soul, is of course expected to confer on them an addition of happiness and glory. But let them consider well, what *further* bliss they reserve, in their imaginations, for their fourth state, after the judgment, when heaven and earth have passed away. In truth, they practically reserve none: but appropriate to themselves, in their second or third state, every particular form of blessing which God has

* Else why does St. Paul say that their names are enrolled in,—or, as it were, *booked-for*—heaven?

* It has been observed that to those that were slain for the witness of Jesus are added those "which had not worshipped the Beast:" or *as many as* (*oitines*) had not worshipped. But these also are martyrs; for "as many as would not worship the image of the Beast were killed." Rev. xiii. 15.

promised to confer *at, and not before* that time when the "blessed of the Father," having been finally judged, "inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world." Nay, in too many instances, they actuall, apply to their supposed third state all the magnificent language in which the closing chapters of the Apocalypse describe the *new post*-millennial heavens and earth! * * * * * * *

There yet remains one important passage, which is commonly held to convey the most direct proof, not of consciousness merely, but of peculiar happiness and glory, during the intermediate state. To the believing robber on the cross, who prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom," our Saviour replied, "*To-day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Beyond dispute, the reward promised was *not* one that might be conferred at the general resurrection; for thus Jesus would merely be remembering the suppliant "when he came in his kingdom;" though in what it actually consisted is less evident. But be it what it may, nothing can be more presumptuous and unwarrantable, than to expect the same reward, or even any reward like it, for all believers in Christ. As well,—nay, *less* presumptuously—might we expect that all who "walked with God" should be translated with Enoch and Elijah, and never see death. For as far as we can judge, the faith of the penitent robber exceeding theirs; as it exceeded that of the apostles, and probably of *every* follower of our Lord. When the enemies of Jesus, to all appearance, prevailed, when he submitted to stripes, insults, and finally the most ignominious death, the triumph of the unbelievers was complete, and the last hopes of his followers seem to have faded away. One of them had betrayed him, another repeatedly denied him, the rest forsook him and fled. His enemies exulted in the proof which, to their minds, his degrading death afforded, that he could not be the anointed of God; saying, If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross and we will believe: that he should save himself was the only way they could imagine of his making good his pretensions. And accordingly one of his fellow sufferers reviled him in the same terms, "If thou be the Son of God, save thyself and us." Then it was that the other malefactor not only rebuked his companion, and bore testimony to the innocence of Jesus, but acknowledged him as a triumphant sovereign about to enter upon his kingdom. * * His faith stood a trial before which that of all the other disciples was shaken. Having once, on good and sufficient grounds believed on Jesus as the Christ, he remained unshaken in his trust, even at the moment when the enemies of the crucified King were filled with triumph, and his disciples with doubt or despair. * * Whether any of us does actually possess faith equal with this man can be known only to the All-wise God. But we may be sure that none of us can *display* equal faith with his, because the circumstances are such as can never occur again. To those therefore, who do not claim for all Christians a faith equal to that of the penitent robber, it must be a matter of comparatively small moment to attempt to determine what is meant, by being with Christ in Paradise.

In all probability however the Paradise intended is *the same as is mentioned elsewhere* in the New Testament. "To him that overcometh," our Lord declared by St. John, "I will give to eat of the tree of life, that groweth in the midst of the Paradise of God." This is evidently a promise of a reward after the general resurrection, when the redeemed shall be permitted to eat of the precious fruit mentioned in the last chapter of the Apocalypse.

The same place of bliss was beheld in vision by St. Paul, whowas "caught up into Paradise," and there heard unutterable words. Into the same place the believing robber was probably admitted as soon as Jesus himself entered it. But notwithstanding the weight due to the expression "to-day," it may be questioned whether our Lord entered Paradise before his ascension, or at the earliest, before his resurrection. For was he in the place to which St. Paul was "caught up,"—in a region belonging to those new heavens which are eventually to "*come down* from God,"—at the very time of his descent into Hades? Was he,—was his human soul,—at once above earth and below it, of whom St. Paul says that he who ascended "*first* descended into the lower parts of the earth?" This seems improbable; and therefore, if a strict interpretation of the expression "to-day" be contended for, there is no alternative but to place Paradise below, in that *Hades*, into which our Lord's human soul most certainly descended. But this alternative would probably be found no less inconvenient: for it is hard to believe that our Lord's human soul was in Paradise *both* when he was in Hades, and also when he left it; or to place it in the Hades which shall eventually be "cast in the lake of fire." Paradise is *probably above*, and was entered by our Lord at his ascension. The question is certainly obscure; but whatever may be understood by Paradise, it can never be shown, that Christians in general have a better claim to be admitted to the privileges of the robber, than they have to be translated or transfigured with Enoch, Elijah, and Moses.

Questions may perhaps be raised,—whether the condition of souls in Hades was not *changed for the better* by the first advent of Christ? or whether the partial victory over death, obtained through His death and resurrection, *operated before the event*, so as to render the conquest of death, over the souls of those who died before our Lord's coming, less complete than it would otherwise have been? Both inquiries are important in reference to the question of an intermediate consciousness. If such consciousness be, as has been maintained above, altogether anticipatory of resurrection, not necessarily or naturally consequent on death, they who died before Christ's coming must have been unconscious, (at least *until* His coming,) unless His resurrection operated by way of anticipation. And that it did so operate is more than can be proved from Scripture. To Adam was given the promise "Thy seed *shall* bruise the serpent's head." The victory was ordained, but not accomplished; the Old Serpent Satan did not immediately feel his deadly wound. The liberation of the souls which were to pass into Hades was also ordained; but it does not follow that the power of the grave was then impaired, and "the gates of hell" shaken, and that the fetters forged by Death for souls yet unborn were then wrested from his hands.

And if Christ's resurrection did not operate *before* the event, neither did it immediately after-

wards.* "The whole creation," says St. Paul, "groaneth and travaileth in pain together *until now*:" that is, "up to this present time," long after the ascension of the Lord. It groaneth thus, every creature groaneth, waiting for the "manifestation of the sons of God," at the resurrection. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ *shall* all be made alive, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Certainly this passage is unfavorable to the belief, that the death originally introduced through Adam is in *any wise* removed through Christ, excepting at his second coming, at which the "dead men shall live."

Again it deserves to be considered, that since our blessed Lord himself, as has been argued above, "tasted death for every man, and through death overcame him that had the power of death," he must, as it appears, from the very nature of the case, have partaken of the full unmitigated penalty of death;—tasted of death, such as, but for His coming, it *would have been* to the soul of every child of Adam. If this be so, it follows that death is, to the soul of every Christian, what it would have been, but for Christ, to the souls of all men; unless we prefer to believe that the faithful followers of our Lord have, as we are nowhere informed, a *better* passage through the dark valley than their Lord himself!

But rejecting this supposition, we must needs conclude that death is now both such as it ever has been, and such as (allowing the supposition) it would have been, but for the Advent of Christ: not being changed *as yet*, in any degree, either in its nature or power, by his first coming, either at the time of his resurrection, or before that event: but still reigning over every deceased soul, forbidding it,—since the God in whom we live and move, and have our being, is not the God of the dead,—to live, to move, or to be.

BAPTISM.

The following communication was received too late, last year, to be inserted in the December number, where we thought best to terminate a discussion which we had reason to think our readers did not care to have continued. Br. Magruder, however, thought it due to him that we should publish his "*final*" reply to Br. Grew. We have concluded to let them both speak once more, which will be considered the end of that controversy in our columns, for the present. All will understand, that these brethren are equally strong in the belief of *immersion* being essential to baptism: they differ only as to its necessity to salvation.

ESSENTIALITY OF BAPTISM DEFENDED.

REPLY TO MR. GREW. No. II.

In the hope that the reader will keep in view *the question in debate* between myself and Mr. Grew, I proceed to offer some reply to his "Response" (in the October number of the Examiner) to my first article.

It is not advisable to expend time and space in combating minor arguments, and seeking small advantages, in such a discussion as this. If *triumph*, instead of *truth*, were the object of our pursuit, such acts might subserve the purpose, but as I hope and believe the discovery of *truth*—that "pearl of great price"—and the vindication of God's ways to man, to be the great object of both, I shall not be tempted to turn aside from the plain and direct path before me. What, then, is the simple issue before us?

I maintain that the baptism or immersion of a believing and penitent subject, is *one* of the conditions of salvation from sins—pardon—regeneration—remission of sins—adoption as a child of God, &c. This Mr. Grew *denies*. Holding the affirmative, of course, the burden of proof devolves on me, and I accept the task, and appeal to the only infallible standard — the word of God — either directly expressed, or clearly implied. Here there can be no mistake. What, then, saith the Scripture? "How readest thou?" I cite the following passages from the sacred record, reserving comment for the present.

1. Mark xvi. 16. "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth *and* is baptized *shall be saved.*"

2. John iii. 5. "*Except* a man be *born of water* and of the spirit, he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God."

3. Acts ii. 38. "Repent *and be baptized*, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, *for the remission of sins.*"

4. Acts xi. 13, 14, in connection with Acts x. 43, 47, 48. The angel said to Cornelius, *Peter* "shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house *shall be saved.*" And Peter said, in fulfilment of this promise, the "words"—"to him give all the prophets witness that, *through his name*, whosoever believeth *on* him shall receive *remission of sins;*" adding, (when he witnessed the descent of the Holy Spirit on these *Gentiles*) "Can any man forbid *water* that these should not be *baptized?*" . . . . . and commanding "them *to be baptized* in the *name of the Lord;*" by all which "words" or commands (baptism included) he and "*all his house*" were *saved*, as promised in the 14th verse of the 11th chapter.

5. 1 Cor. xv. 2, in connection with Acts xviii. 8. "The gospel I preached unto you—by which also ye are *saved*," &c. Read 1 Cor. xv. with Acts xviii. 8: "Many of the Corinthians *hearing* believed *and were baptized.*" Thus, they were "*saved*" by belief *and* baptism.

6. Acts xxii. 16. Ananias to Saul, "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise *and be baptized*, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord."

So far the testimony of the "Gospels" and "Acts," the historical records of the sayings and acts of our Lord and his apostles in the progress of their proclamation of the gospel "for the *obedience* of faith among all nations." I shall now cite the testimony derived from another part of the same record, addressed to persons differently situated, viz: that contained in the "Epistles," which, we know, were letters addressed to those who were *already* Christians. I shall show, from this authority, that these were addressed as those who *had*

* Except perhaps in the case of the comparatively few "saints which slept," who arose and came out of their graves after Christ's resurrection, manifesting *thus*, (and not by any mere change in their disembodied souls,) His power who now held the keys of Hades: and who, as there is reason to *conjecture*, never returned to the tomb.

been baptized, and were thus recognized as "*saved*," "*washed*," "*regenerated*," "renewed," become "the children of God," &c., with direct, plain, and undeniable citations and allusions to *baptism* as *one* of the means *by which* they had changed their state before God. "To the law and to the testimony" again!

1. Rom. vi. 2—5. "How shall we (Christians) that are *dead to sin*, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as *were* baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him *by baptism* into death, that like as *Christ* was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, *we* also should walk *in newness of life*;" i. e. *after* baptism the "*newness of life*" begins, and *not before*.

2. 1 Cor. vi. 10, 11. "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God—nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, &c. &c. And such *were* some of you: but ye are *washed*, but ye are sanctified, but ye are *justified* in the name of the Lord Jesus," &c. Now these *very Corinthians*, we have seen, were "*saved*" by belief and *baptism*, according to 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2, and Acts xviii. 8.

3. Gal. iii. 27. "As many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on* Christ." How, then, of those who have *not* been baptized into Christ? Have *they* "put *on*" Christ? Mr. Grew will hardly say so, I think. If not, *then* baptism *is* an *essential condition* of putting *on* Christ.

4. Ephesians v. 25, 26. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the *washing of water* by the word." A plain allusion to baptism as a means of sanctification.

5. Coloss. ii. 12. "Buried with him in *baptism*, WHEREIN also ye are *risen* with him," to that "*newness of life*" spoken of, under the same figure, in Rom. vi.

6. Titus iii. 5. "According to his mercy he SAVED US,"—(*How*? I ask,)—"by THE WASHING OF REGENERATION and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," &c.

Is not the "*washing of regeneration*" baptism? If *not*, *what* is it? Will Mr. Grew accept the learned Dr. McKnight's rendering—"According to his *own* mercy, through the *bath* of regeneration" (adding in a note, i. e. "THROUGH BAPTISM!") "he *saved* us," &c.

7. Hebrews x. 22, 23. "Let us draw nigh with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water." Is not here an allusion to that preparation—*baptism* being a *part* of the process—which is essential to acceptable worship, "in the full assurance of faith?"

8. 1 Peter iii. 18—22. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were *saved by water*. The like figure whereunto *even baptism doth also now save us* (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

I pause here, and I submit it to Mr. Grew and the candor of the reader, if this testimony from Holy Writ does not establish the position, beyond doubt or question, that *baptism is essential to salvation*? Peter declares above, that Noah was "*saved by water*,"—and immediately adds, so, too, *baptism*, of which the flood was the type, "doth *also* now *save us*." Yet Mr. Grew insists it does *not* save us. That we are saved without it. Well, I only reply again, Mr. Grew and Peter are directly *at issue*, and it is vain to escape this dilemma by his reply, "the question is, is Mr. Magruder's *construction* of the passage correct?" for it is not a question of construction. I offer *no* construction. I cite Peter's plain and positive declaration, "*baptism* DOTH *also now save us*;" and it is *that* Mr. Grew combats and denies. I hope he will candidly acknowledge the error, and not impeach the apostle's veracity. In any other than an unkind spirit, I beg my respected and intelligent correspondent to remember the solemn injunction in Romans iii. 4.

It would require more space than the "Examiner" can spare, to present a commentary on the several passages of scripture which have been cited above. I regret that the time fails me to show how they *all*, when fairly and intelligently construed, harmonize, and sustain the general conclusion.

In religious, as well as in all other controversy, extremes are apt to beget each other. Thus has it been with baptism. The Roman Catholics, the earliest apostates and corrupters of the truth—by administering the rite to infants and idiots—by the absurd practice of *clinical* baptism, and similar mummeries, drove the Reformers to the opposite error of undervaluing the ordinance, and denying its essential efficacy, even when properly administered to a fit subject; so that while the Romanist yet upholds its necessity, and even superstitiously magnifies its virtue, the Protestant, concluding the *very* opposite must be right, argues that it is wholly unimportant, and therefore either neglects it altogether, like the Quaker, or contents himself with the Paido-baptist *apology* of SPRINKLING, whilst the *Baptist* sectary, afraid of his orthodoxy, invents a *compromise*, by holding it important *enough* to be made a test of fellowship at the Lord's table, but not so essential as to interpose a barrier to fraternal relations in any other respects. This last, with strange inconsistency, rejects those whom the Lord has received; for if *Christians*, though unbaptized, and on that account denied his fellowship, is it not clear that, in his zeal for his sectarian badge, he has been driven to the *exclusion* of those who (being *in Christ*, as he allows,) have been recognized and adopted by the Master! Such are the consequences of a blind adherence to sectarian tenets, rather than the "word of the truth of the gospel."

Mr. Grew will pardon me, I trust, for presuming to say, in conclusion, that I think I discern the source of his error in regard to the subject in debate. It is of easy discovery, and belongs to all that class of disputants whose minds have reached a foregone conclusion, and, instead of following out the testimony to its legitimate results, look around for authority to support an opinion already embraced. He argues that baptism cannot be essential, because salvation is so often associated with *faith* as its instrumental cause. This is granted. But it is not thence to be inferred that baptism is *excluded*, any more than repentance,

holiness, the love of God, the blood of Christ, good works, &c. The truth is, that *all* these *together*, and no one or two *alone*, are so many *means* to an *end*. In the scriptures, we are said to be saved by faith, by grace, by hope, by baptism, by works, by the blood of Christ, by holiness, by the word, by the spirit, &c. Now, while Mr. Grew would exclude some of these—baptism, for example—I would insist on *all* as essential to the grand consummation What *God* has joined together, *I* would not put asunder. To quote passages to show that salvation is by faith, and thus argue that baptism was a non-essential, would be as wise and pertinent as to cite authority from a work on architecture to prove that a foundation was a necessary part of a house, and therefore the walls and the roof were *non-essentials*.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

H. GREW'S REPLY.

By reference to my former articles, my friend will find my arguments to disprove his construction of some of the texts he has adduced in the present communication. I shall not repeat all these arguments. I submit it to his intelligent consideration, whether or not, as "an ally" to Dr. Thomas, he ought to show, if he can, the fallacy of my arguments, instead of re-quoting the texts and repeating the objectionable constructions. Other passages, however, are now quoted, which demand our impartial consideration. Far be it, that any of us should seek "triumph instead of truth." I desire to bring every theological opinion to the test of that word which abideth for ever: even the opinion, which consigns thousands of the holiest and most devoted servants of the Lord Jesus, since the days of the apostles, to the lake which burneth with brimstone and with fire, which is the second death! We must not shrink from the scriptural investigation of a tenet, although it clearly implies that such men as Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, John Knox, George Whitefield, Philip Doddridge, and a host of holy men, who have willingly gone to the stake for the truth of the Lord Jesus, because they did not understand their duty to be immersed in water, will be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power!!"

Mark 16: 16, and John 3: 5, I have already considered.

Before commenting on other passages, I beg leave to call attention to a scriptural fact which may aid us in coming to the knowledge of the truth on the question at issue. We find two classes of passages in the holy volume. One class teaching us all Christian duties, and another teaching us what will certainly exclude us from the kingdom of God. These must not be confounded. Our Lord makes this distinction, Mark 16: 16, between faith and baptism. Many true Christians "suffer loss" by their prejudices against, and misapprehension of, some truths; yet they shall be saved. A man suffers inconveniences and delay, by not choosing the very best road to the place of his destination. This, however, is no proof that he will never arrive there.

Acts 2: 38 connects repentance and baptism with "the remission of sins." In the case of Paul, washing away of sin (in some sense) was connected with baptism. Col. 2: 12, rising with Christ is connected with it. Peter, 1 Epis 3: 21, connects it with salvation. Are we not, by other passages relative to the subject, to ascertain *in what sense* baptism is to be understood in these texts? Now it is a remarkable fact, that in every one, baptism is connected with something else, without which it would be worthless? In one it is connected with faith, in another with repentance, in another with "calling on the Name of the Lord," and in another, with "the faith of the operation of God." Yea, in the *only* passage which declares that the *figure* of baptism *saves* us, the inspired apostle precludes the idea of this "*figure*" saving us, in any other sense than *figuratively*, by saying, "*not the putting away the filth of the flesh*, but the answer of a good conscience towards God." Were Simon Magus, Ananias and Saphira, Demas, &c., saved by immersion in water, in any other sense than *figuratively* or *professedly*? I ask my opponents whether a "FIGURE" (1 Peter 3: 21) saves *really* or *figuratively*? Mr. Magruder's comments and inferences on this passage are as unworthy of his good sense as of his christian charity. He remarks, "Mr. Grew and Peter are directly at issue." What does Mr. Grew say? I say that baptism is a figure of our salvation, and that it does not really save us, nor is it absolutely essential to real and eternal salvation. What does Peter say? He says that baptism is a "*figure*," and saves us, but that it is "not the putting away the filth of the flesh (i. e. by water) which saves us, but the answer of a good conscience towards God." My friend objects to my question, "Is Mr. Magruder's construction of the passage correct?" adding, "I offer no construction." Is it no "construction," to say that the passage imports the essentiality of immersion to eternal salvation? Does Peter say this, or any thing which necessarily implies it? Let every candid reader judge. Mr. M. further remarks, "I cite Peter's plain and positive declaration, "*bapeism* DOTH *also now save us*," "and it is *that* Mr. Grew combats and denies." Mr. G. does *not* deny this. I admit it *in the sense which Peter explains it in the entire passage*. Mr. M.'s citation is partial. Why did he not fairly quote the whole of it? I deny my friend's inference that the passage implies that no man can be saved without immersion in water. *For this* he is pleased to represent that I "impeach the apostle's veracity!" Suppose that I misapprehend the apostle, in understanding him that the "figure" of baptism saves us only *figuratively*; is this *impeaching his veracity*? I ask, with christian meekness, that Mr. M. would consider the fact, that, on a *mutilated* passage, *withholding that part which supports my view*, he bases, not only the above serious charge, but implicitly (by referring me to Rom. 3: 4) the more awful one, of being a *liar* against God! "Judge not that ye be not judged," &c.

Acts 2: 38. The plain and numerous promises of pardon to penitent believers in the scriptures refute my opponents' construction of this passage. I have examined their reply to this declaration, and endeavored to show the fallacy of it. It remains for them to prove that I have not done so.

Acts 11: 13, 14, in connection with 10: 43, 47, 48. Peter "shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house *shall be saved*." What words? "To Him (i. e. Jesus Christ) give all the prophets

witness that through his Name, *whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins.*" Thus do "all the prophets witness" against my opponents, who teach that there are thousands who believe on the Savior, who *never* "receive remission of sins." The apostle indeed "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." May we justly infer from this that no man can be saved without baptism? What are the premises from which this inference must fairly flow? That the knowledge of, and obedience to, ALL the commandments of the Lord is essential to salvation. This is a false principle, for it is in manifest contradiction to scriptural precept and to scriptural fact. It is opposed to the imperative requisition to receive the "weak" (or ignorant) who are "in the faith" of the Lord Jesus. Rom. 14: 1, 3. It is opposed to the fact of the believer being recognized as a christian by the apostle who, like modern trinitarians, had not a correct knowledge of the divine unity, (1 Cor. 8 chap.) a subject of much more importance than a correct knowledge of the figurative ordinance of immersion. The argument proves too much, and, consequently, proves nothing. You may as well quote Acts 2: 42, to prove that the christian, who conscientiously declines the literal breaking of bread in commemoration of the death of Jesus Christ, understanding it (erroneously) merely in a spiritual sense, cannot be saved. On the same principle we must make the correct knowledge and practice of all things pertaining to the order of the christian church essential to salvation.

1 Cor. 15: 20, in connection with Acts 18: 8, proves that we are saved by the truth of the Gospel. The declaration that the Corinthians "hearing, believed and were baptized," certainly does not necessarily imply that baptism is essential to salvation. Indeed if the declaration was, that they were *saved* by hearing, believing and being baptized, it would no more necessarily imply that they could not be saved without baptism, than the declaration that A. was saved from drowning by B. C. and D. necessarily implies that he could not have been saved without D.

Acts 22: 16, must be understood figuratively. The sins of Simon Magus were not really washed away by baptism. To have our sins cancelled or washed away and to be justified, are synonymous expressions. We are justified by faith, which *precedes* baptism.

Rom. 6: 2—5. It is preposterous to understand this passage otherwise than figuratively. The allusion is indeed to our literal baptism, but were we literally "baptized into his (Christ's) *death?*" Our immersion in water is figurative of our holy change, we die to sin and rise to "newness of life." So far from the figurative ordinance being essential to this holy "newness of life," it is an undeniable fact that among *real* christians, we find some unimmersed more holy in their habitual walk than some of the immersed.

1 Cor. 6: 10, 11. Here are the persons enumerated who shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Alas! for our opponents, the *unbaptized* are not among them. It is well for the penitent believing thief and many others of the godly. It is for Mr. M. to inform us the reason of this important omission from this and every similar passage in the oracles of truth.

Gal. 3: 27. The question, "Have they (who have not been baptized) put on Christ?" I not only answer in the affirmative, but affirm that some of this class do so, *more* than some real christians who are immersed. They are indeed in fault; neglecting, through ignorance, to put on Christ in the ordinance of immersion. I ask my friend if he will deny, that those put on Christ, who "put off the old man" and "put on the new," who "put on, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another and forgiving one another?" I pray that he may put on Christ by forbearing his weak brother.

Eph. 5: 25, 26. I admit that baptism is, to believers, "a means of sanctification." This, however, is no proof that all other means, *without this*, are inadequate to that sanctification which is essential to salvation.

Col. 2: 12, I have answered.

Titus 3: 5. I have no objection to McKnight's rendering. "The bath of regeneration." I admit the allusion to be to immersion. But I ask, was their immersion *real* "regeneration," or was it a figure or profession of their previous renewal? Was Demas really regenerated by baptism? No man is qualified for baptism who is not previously regenerated.

Heb. 10: 22, 23, admits of a similar answer. Baptism is an important part of that worship which is "acceptable" to God; but this is not proof that it is *so* important that no worship can be acceptable without it.

1 Peter 3: 18—22, is answered.

You think that the Romanist "superstitiously magnifies (the) virtue" of baptism. Surely he may say, "Physician heal thyself."

I cordially unite with you in your charge of inconsistency against those baptists who make immersion "a test of fellowship at the Lord's table," but not "to fraternal relations in any other respect."

In my remarks on the term "born of water," B. Ex., Vol. III., page 116, you will find a reply to some of your closing remarks. You should have proved the fallacy of this reply, if you can. "I would insist" on obedience to *all* the holy principles, and also to *all* the ordinances of the Gospel, as *essential to the perfect christian*. Blessed be God, he does not reject, or allow his children to reject, the "weak in the faith," because they are not thus perfect. You say, "what God has joined together, *I* would not put asunder." To this my inmost mind responds. The question is, Has God joined together, faith in his Son, &c., and baptism, *not only as duties*, but as duties *essential to salvation?* What is the fact? What has *Jesus Christ* done in relation to this matter? In the great Commission, when he sent forth his disciples for the salvation of a lost world, he *joined* faith and baptism *as duties*, and *separated* them *as essential to salvation*, resting final and eternal condemnation on unbelief *only*. Mark 16: 16. You therefore, I think, *join what Christ has separated*, which is no less objectionable than to put asunder what he has joined.

I hold that God's promise of salvation to the believer in Jesus excludes every thing, *as essential to salvation*, but what is essential to faith in his Son. If not, his promise fails. Faith and love, i. e. obedience to all his known commands, are inseparably connected. Baptism is not so con-

nected. This is an important truth, overlooked in your argumentation. The pertinency of your final illustration depends altogether on the question, whether or not baptism is as essential to salvation, as the walls and roof of the house are to the existence of the house? "To quote passages" which show that baptism is a duty and essential to *a perfect christian*, and argue that without it no man can be saved, "would be as wise and pertinent, as to cite authority from a work on architecture, to prove that" a variety of things are necessary to a *perfect* house, and then conclude that if one of these is lacking, it is *no house at all*.

In the commencement of his article, my friend expresses his "hope," that "the discovery of truth" is "the object of both." I regret to perceive that, in the close, his charity takes wings. He sits in judgment on my motives, and traces my supposed error to a disposition "to support an opinion already embraced," instead of "following out the testimony to its legitimate results." I pray the Lord to grant us both a single eye to his holy truth.

HENRY GREW.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"*He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*"—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our absence has prevented the appearance of the Examiner sooner this month; and now we have not half funds enough to pay the printer. Still we will redeem *our* pledge to issue the November and December numbers to complete this volume, trusting that the expense *will* be met. So far as we have conversed with the readers of the Examiner, there has been but one expression in regard to its continuance, and their willingness to pay *one dollar* per year for it, just as cheerfully as they have paid fifty cents heretofore. We expect to be able to interest our readers the coming year not less than the present, but of that they will be able to judge as we proceed. The greatly increasing interest on the immortality question in England will furnish us, we expect, with much matter of instruction.

Terms of the Examiner, for 1850, *one dollar*. For $5 six copies will be sent, and for $10 thirteen, to any address that may be ordered.

All communications and remittances designed for the Examiner, should be addressed, "GEORGE STORRS, Philadelphia, Pa."

LATE VISIT NORTH.—Since the last Examiner was issued we have visited Albany and Utica, N. Y. We spent about one week in each place, and had good and attentive congregations. Albany is where we originally preached our "Six Sermons." In our visit there, now, we dwelt mainly on the prophecies. At Utica we had never preached on the question of immortality. We were residing at that place in 1837, when our attention was, for the first time, drawn to contemplate the possibility that wicked men might utterly perish, though we did not become settled in that view till 1840, some two years after we removed from there. We now felt a satisfaction in visiting that place; and the reception we met with from some of our old friends was truly comforting and refreshing. We know not when we have passed a few days with so much satisfaction. For the first time, in that city, we opened our mouth on immortality, eternal life, as no part of man's inheritance by creation or generation; but only a gift bestowed by God through Jesus Christ on those who by patient continuance in well doing SEEK FOR it. Truly, never did we realize more of the presence and blessing of God, for a few days, than in our ministrations at Utica; and we cannot but believe that the word spoken will prove a savor of life unto life to some who heard it. Two evenings, after our discourses, we gave full liberty for any who chose to question us; and about half or three-quarters of an hour was thus occupied each of those evenings, which, we trust, gave satisfaction to all, and tended much to give interest to the subject, as many questions were asked and answered.

VOLUMES OF THE EXAMINER BOUND.—We shall have the volumes for '48 and '49 bound in one immediately after the next number is issued. Those who may wish the work must send their orders soon, as it is only a limited number that we can now furnish for *both years*. The *price* will be $1.25 single copy, or five copies for $5.00.

"WHO WILL LIVE FOREVER?"—We have just received "A Reply to the Rev. John Howard Hinton's Criticism on Luke xx: 36, with an Appendix on the Signification of the terms Life and Death. By Edward White, Minister of the Church of Christ at Hereford," England. We presume we are indebted to the author, or Dr. Lees, Leeds, for the favor. Whichever it may be, he will please accept our thanks. We shall give a part if not the whole of it in future numbers of the Examiner.

We have yet much matter by the English writers on the immortality question, which has been necessarily crowded out this year, that may be expected in our next volume, and new matter is multiplying by the discussion in England.

TO THE READERS OF THE EXAMINER.—Two years ago I became associated in the editorial department of the Bible Examiner. I have now deemed it

best to withdraw my connection, and, in doing so, I desire to bid a kind farewell to all its readers. It is not necessary to enumerate the reasons of my dissolving this connection; and I will therefore detain you no longer, but most devoutly pray, that "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit may ever be with you." JOHN TOMLIN WALSH.

November 1st, 1849.

DONATIONS since our last to complete this volume.

John Stetler, Philadelphia,	$1.00
Capt. Bloomer, Jersey City, N. J.,	1.00
William Mayell, Albany, N. Y.,	3.00

NOTES ON "ATHANASIA."

No. III.

Mr. Hinton maintains that "There are no texts that teach never ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers." "The phrase everlasting life," he says, "is unquestionably used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed; and it cannot, therefore, when so used, be understood according to a different analogy, that is, of never-ending existence." p. 123.

The question is not whether the phrase is *sometimes* used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed, but—Is that its *general* or uniform use? We maintain that it is not: and that it is not its *primary* use. And we appeal to Mr. Hinton, himself, whether that phrase could *alone*, or by itself, without other texts of Scripture, prove the *happiness* of the redeemed at all? and whether we are not dependant upon more explicit declarations as to the happiness of saints beyond this state? The saints *live* now, but they are far from being always happy. Eternal life, then, for all that phrase alone can determine, may not be always happy. To quote a solitary text, in which Paul says, "Now we *live* if ye stand fast in the faith," to prove the phrase life is sometimes used analogically to signify happiness, and then come to the conclusion that "The phrase everlasting life is unquestionably used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed," is truly a summary way of coming to the conclusion that in the multiplied times in which the phrase occurs, it does not mean "never-ending existence." But to do Mr. H. justice, we say, his language is very guarded here; yet to us it seems strangely contradictory. He says, "the phrase is used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed, and *when so used*, cannot be understood of never-ending existence:" which language implies an admission that it is *not always* "so used." Pray, then, what does it mean when not so used? for he says—"There are no texts that teach never ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers:" yet the phrase eternal or everlasting life is either directly or indirectly used uniformly to teach *something* that is the gift of Christ, or the gift of God *through* Christ, to his followers. Pray what is it, if not never-ending existence, when *not used* for happiness? On this point Mr. H. has left us in the dark, and we must wait for light.

We now join issue with Mr. Hinton on his assumption that "There are no texts that teach never-ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers." We begin with Rom. 5. Here the apostle "is unquestionably" speaking of death in the primary sense of the term. And for the sake of meeting Mr. H. fairly, we will let him have his own definition of the term. "Death," he says, "in its strict and primary import, signifies nothing more than that condition of an organized substance in which the organic functions have ceased:" p. 38. Rom. 5: 12,—The apostle says—"By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin; and so death passed upon all men: * * * * Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression: * * * If by one man's offence *death* reigned by one; MUCH MORE they which *receive abundance* of grace and of the gift of righteousness [*followers of Christ*] shall *reign* IN LIFE by one, Jesus Christ: * * * *as* by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation [*to death*—"dust thou art unto dust shalt thou return:" see Gen. 3: 19, the only condemnation Paul could have referred to:] *even so* by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of LIFE; [the exact opposite of what came upon all by Adam's sin, *viz.* a resurrection from the dead;] *as* sin hath reigned unto *death*, [in the primary sense,] even *so* might grace reign through righteousness unto ETERNAL LIFE by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Here is plainly life and death contrasted. That the word death is here used in its primary sense, we presume Mr. Hinton will not call in question: life, then, must also be used in its primary sense. Let Mr. H. have its primary sense according to his liking, *viz:* "the active or living condition of organic substances;" and then it follows that the future active or living condition of the organic substances entering into the resurrection organism of the followers of Christ is a free "*gift*," bestowed "by Jesus Christ:" and that organism is said to be "eternal" to such as "*receive*" the grace of God, and the "*righteousness*," or holiness which is essential to ensure the ETERNAL *life* promised. Here then, to our mind, nothing can be plainer than that the phrase "eternal life" is used to signify "never-ending existence" in a conscious state. If this were the only text to prove this point we should think we have fairly shown that Mr. H. is mistaken in his assumption: or, at least, it forms an *exception* to the *uniform* use of the phrase in the sense of "happiness," and leaves us at full liberty to use it generally, yea, uniformly, to denote eternal conscious existence, unless it can be shown that there are exceptions, and then these particular cases will not affect the general use of the term to express "never ending existence."

Thus far we have proceeded on the ground that Mr. Hinton's definition of the primary sense of the words life and death is the correct one, and have met him on his own ground: but we dissent entirely from him in the definition of those words. Our previous articles give our reasons for doing so on the word life; and as he, after defining what is the primary sense of the term death, p. 38, says,—"Life is no doubt its opposite," we do not judge it necessary to spend labor to show what is the primary meaning of the word death. We have attempted to show, in our first article, what is the primary meaning of the word life; if we were suc-

cessful in that attempt, as he has admitted death and life are opposites, we have equally established the point that his view of the *primary* meaning of the word death is erroneous: it is not merely the disorganization of organic substances, but the cessation of *conscious* existence. This being lost by the first death, is restored to men by Christ through a resurrection, but is *eternal* only to those who have become *righteous* under whatever dispensation they may have lived. Though they have never heard of Christ, their future life, by a resurrection from the dead, comes through and by him; and whether that life shall be eternal, depends upon whether they have "feared God and worked righteousness" according to the light they had. Christ came that men "might have LIFE, and that they might have it more abundantly:" even an ETERNAL LIFE. See John 10: 10.

THE "TRUE WESLEYAN" AGAIN.

The editor of that paper, in his article which we copied into the August number of the Examiner, says:—

"If the soul is not immortal in its own nature, it must cease to exist by the operation of the laws of its being, just as the body does, and can need no destruction from the Almighty, any more than the body, to cause it to cease to exist. To argue that God can destroy the soul, as Mr. Storrs does, implies that it will not die of itself, without the direct exertion of Almighty Power to do it. The body is mortal, is a compound, an organism, and by the operation of the laws of its elemental and organic nature, must wear itself out and cease to exist, without being destroyed by the direct operation of external force, as is implied when Mr. Storrs affirms that God can destroy the soul. On the other hand, if the soul is a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible, it must be immortal in itself, and must exist forever, unless actually destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it existence."

There are several points here to which we wish to call attention. Br. Lee admits the *body* is *not* "immortal in its own nature;" and that "by the operation of the laws of its elemental and organic nature, must wear itself out and cease to exist, [be "*annihilated?* ED.] without being destroyed by the direct operation of external force," &c. Br. Lee here affirms too much. What is it but a plain declaration that the "body" "must cease to exist"—be "annihilated"—whether man had sinned or not! So Br. Lee fully gives up the natural immortality of man's body; for, the body would "die of itself, without the exertion of Almighty Power to do it," he says. According to this logic, "death" did not "enter the world *by sin*," as Paul tells us it did; for our logician plainly affirms that "the body must cease to exist [be "*annihilated*"] by the operation of the laws of its being." So it turns out that Paul was mistaken, and man's body would have died—"ceased to exist"—been "annihilated"—if sin had not entered into the world. Thus, after all, man was only *half* immortal at creation; then our opponents admit *half* we contend for; that's something gained in the argument, though we do not hold ourself responsible for the position on that point Br. Lee has assumed. But as man naturally was only *half* immortal, let us see how Br. Lee disposes of the *other half, viz.*, the soul.

He says—"The soul is a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible." We ask, where is the proof of this assertion? Of course it is in his *logic*, for it is not in the Bible. He says the soul is an "essence." What does he mean by "*essence?*" The essence of a thing is "the nature of a thing." Sometimes it signifies "existence." We do not know in which sense he uses the term; nor does it matter. He admits that the soul is created. If it is created, it is something that has "organism:" for the very idea of creation is *organism:* if it has organism it must be compounded; if it is compounded it is divisible, and Br. Lee's assumption falls to the ground. There is no way that we can see to avoid this conclusion but to deny that the soul is created; and we hope for the honor of Christianity he will not assume that pagan fable. We state the matter thus—If the soul is created it is an organism: if it is an organism it is compounded: if it is compounded it is divisible: if it is divisible it is not in itself immortal. And, if Br. Lee's reasoning is correct about the body, it follows that the soul will "die of itself—wear itself out and cease to exist," unless causes out of itself prevent it.

But, says Br. Lee in another part of his argument, if the soul dies with the body there can be no resurrection—it must be a new creation—it is another man. But we ask him to stop and look at his statement that the "body must cease to exist [be "annihilated"] by the laws of its being." Then at death, according to his own theory, and to use still his own phraseology, the body *is* "annihilated." If so, then on his theory, *its* resurrection is impossible—it must be a new creation—another body which the soul had never seen before, and for aught its own consciousness could determine might be entirely a new one; and thus his theory is as fatal to the resurrection of *the body* as he would try to make it appear ours is to the resurrection of *the man.*

But his entire blast so far as aimed at us, or our Six Sermons, to use a phrase of brother Hinton, was "discharged into a sand bank." In other words—a creature of his own imagining. Br. Lee says—"Mr. Storrs affirms that God can destroy the soul by the direct operation of external force." His reasoning against us is all based on this expression, which he says, "is implied" in our position. If he had quoted us a little further his argument might have been saved. We add—"God can, if he will, destroy, or CAUSE *to cease* to have existence the souls he has made." Now God can "cause to cease" from conscious existence any creature he has made by a direct act of power, *or* by withholding that power by which he upholds living beings. Does Br. Lee doubt this? We presume not. Our argument which he quotes, and labors to destroy the force of, had reference to only one point, *viz.* the assumed position of our opponents that "Nothing can be destroyed:" *i. e.*, "no power can *destroy* any thing, and especially the soul." Without stopping at first to reason out the case that every created thing would go to destruction of itself if not upheld by its Creator, we dashed at once in the face of our opposers *the power of God.* "He is ABLE to destroy both soul and body." Remember it is what our Lord "affirms," not "Mr. Storrs" only, as Br. L. insinuates. This blast, it seems, near put Br. Lee's eyes out; for to the end of his chapter, on that topic, he could

see nothing but the *power* of God *must* be used to destroy the sinner, if destroyed at all; which we did *not* "affirm." But we can excuse Br. Lee for not seeing it: the first bolt we threw from the Bible against the favorite theory he was trying to prop up, closed his eyes to all that followed.

But Br. Lee says:—

"If God should annihilate the human soul, it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which he put forth when he created it, and which not only sustains every human soul, but the universe of both matter and mind. This mode of annihilation forms no part of the creed of destructionists; they argue their doctrine from the Scriptures, which threaten and describe the punishment of the wicked; and represent the loss of existence as a part of, and end of this punishment, and as the result of positive infliction and suffering; and hence, they rely upon the words, destroy, burned up, consumed, and other like expressions."

Without going into a labored argument, we will show the inconclusiveness of the remarks by supposing Abraham to have said concerning Sodom and Gomorrah—"If God should destroy those cities it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which he put forth when he created them—therefore it is folly to talk of their destruction as the result of positive infliction and suffering." Because "it would require a simple withdrawal of Almighty Power" to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, must God therefore have his hands tied so that he cannot bring about their destruction by "positive infliction and suffering?" Is this our brother's *logic?* If so, it *is not* ours. We believe as fully as he can, that "it would require" —*necessarily*—only "a simple withdrawal of Almighty Power" to affect the destruction of the sinner; neither would it have required any more to destroy Sodom, or the inhabitants of the old world; but is God shut up to this method to destroy men? or, *may* he do it with *open* marks of his abhorrence of sin by effecting the destruction of the ungodly by "positive infliction and suffering?" And if he has said he will do it in this latter way, shall our opponents say he "cannot do it?" Shall Br. Lee, or any one else, say—"God cannot annihilate [destroy] in *this way?*" But adds Br. Lee—"If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it." Suppose we were to admit that, would that prove that HE who "*made*" it could not "act upon it" to *destroy* as well as to "make?" But we reply again, as in our previous remarks, to talk of *immateriality* being "*made*" is talking a palpable contradiction. Br. Lee further says—"God cannot dissolve that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible." In this we are agreed. But the soul [using the term soul in Br. Lee's sense of a distinct entity] being "made" is neither uncompounded nor indivisible.

Again he says:—

"The reader is requested to bear in mind that the question at this point, is not—would the soul fall back into non-existence, should God withdraw his creating and sustaining power? but—can the soul be burned up, or be annihilated by the exertion of power upon it?"

Thus he seems to admit that "the soul would fall back into non-existence should God withdraw his *creating* and sustaining power." *Power* then brought the soul into existence, by its "*exertion*;" but he affirms that God its Creator "by the exertion of power upon it" cannot send it back to "non-existence." Has Br. Lee learned in the schools of immortal-soulism to limit the Power of the Almighty! Or, did the dreadful text we shot in our Six Sermons—"God is *able* to destroy both soul and body"—so completely *bewilder* him that he knew not what he was doing? But we will not press him any further now, "lest he should be swallowed up with over much sorrow:" for sure we are he has made a fearful plunge towards Atheism in his attempt to save immortal-soulism, and has denied what he at first seemed to admit; for he said in the first quoted paragraph the soul "must exist forever, *unless* actually destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it existence."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—NO. IV.

LUKE 21: 23 to 36 CONSIDERED.

In this portion of Scripture our Lord speaks of things future relating to the Jews—their city—the Gentiles—signs to be witnessed—his own second coming—the redemption of his people, and concludes with solemn admonitions and cautions. To these things we "do well to take heed." A large portion of what our Lord here utters in prophecy, has since become *history*. The fulfilment of so large a part makes it certain, that whatever may remain unfulfilled will assuredly come to pass. This prophecy, in the part accomplished, is demonstration of the truth and divinity of our Lord's claim to be the Messiah, and establishes the truth of revelation beyond any attempt to overthrow it; and infidelity is as powerless for evil, to a sincere inquirer after truth, as the foaming waves dashing against the rocks of Gibralter. Said the Saviour; "There shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people"—the Jews. Did it not happen exactly as prophesied? Will any one pretend to deny but that unparalleled distress fell upon that people? Let them read the history of the Jews, particularly from the time Jerusalem was "compassed about with armies," in A. D. 67, to the seige and fall of the fortress of Masada, A. D. 71.

Luke 21: 24, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

"They," the Jews, "shall fall by the edge of the sword;" that is, in war, many of them; not all. Hundreds of thousands of them did thus fall. The remainder of them were "led away captive into all nations:" thus the prophecy has had an exact fulfilment; and the Jews are a standing and perpetual monument, that Jesus, whom their nation abhorred and rejected, is in truth the Messiah of whom Moses and the Prophets spake. They bear an unwilling testimony to this great gospel declaration, that Jesus of Nazareth was approved of God, and is the anointed Saviour. But the prophecy goes on to say,—"Jerusalem shall be trodden down, [*i. e.* be made subject to, or be under the government] of the Gentiles, [*i. e.* other nations, as distinguished from the Jews,] until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." So it has come to pass. From the days of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, no Jew has held power or authority there, and much of the time has not been permitted even to approach the city; or, if there at all, only in the most abject condition. "The times of the Gentiles," of course, is an *appointed* time,

indicated in some other prophecy; most likely in the book of Daniel; but of that we shall not now inquire; it is sufficient for us to know, that the time of Gentile rule over Jerusalem has its bounds beyond which it cannot pass. Our Lord next proceeds to give *signs* which were to indicate to the watchful and sincerely inquiring mind, that this treading under foot was about to terminate. These are as follows:

Luke 21: 25, 26, "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring. Men's hearts failing them, for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of Heaven shall be shaken."

The signs in the sun, called in other places the sun being darkened, are supposed by some to have had a fulfilment in the dark day of 1780. We cannot, with present light, assent to that view. The darkning of the sun on that day was not on the *prophetic* land at all. It was confined mostly, if not wholly, to the United States, and was witnessed only by a small part even of these. The phenomenon, or signs, according to the analogy of prophecy, must appear in the prophetic earth. or land. This, at most, embraced only the old Roman empire, which was in its imperial glory when this prophecy was uttered. If then, these signs in the sun and moon are to be witnessed in those literal orbs, we are compelled to the belief that they are future. We suggest, however, a different interpretation; which, if not correct, is at least very remarkable.

We learn from Genesis 1: 14—18, that the lights in the firmament of heaven were not only to divide the day from the night, but "*for* SIGNS;" and that the sun was "*to* RULE *the day*," and the moon and stars *to* RULE *the night*." Hence, in very early times, the people of God used them as *signs* of authority and dominion. Thus, we find Jacob interpreting Joseph's dream of the sun, moon and eleven stars, making obeisance to him, as an indication that the father, mother, and his other sons were to do him homage, or become subjects to Joseph. Whence this conclusion, but from the well known fact, that these heavenly bodies were signs of power and authority? The sun was the sign, or symbol of the highest authority; which, in the case before us, pointed out Jacob the head and supreme ruler of his house, or tribe. The moon denoted the next in authority, *viz*, the mother of the family: then came the stars—the sons, or rulers of an inferior class. This use of the sun, moon, and stars is seen throughout the Jewish prophets, and we may therefore conclude such was the design of our Lord in the text before us, Luke 21.

We now proceed to an inquiry as to what ruling powers are denoted by these luminaries in this prophecy. We conclude we are to look for them in the Roman empire; and that which most naturally presents itself, as symbolised by the sun, is the *imperial* power of Rome, which was holding its sway at the time the prophecy before us was uttered. That the sun is used as a symbol of that power, by the "faithful and true witness." Rev. 8: 12, is admitted, so far as we know, by all commentators. This point established, then, in symbolical language, the darkning of the sun, or signs in the sun, will signify signs of its decay and extinction. Centuries ago there were signs of the decay of the imperial power of Rome, but its extinction did not occur till the present century. That power was removed by Constantine to Constantinople. There it continued till 1453; when, in the eastern empire, it gave place to the *moon* power, of which we shall soon speak. Before the imperial power was displaced in the east it had been restored in the west by Charlemagne, A. D. 800. In the western Roman empire it continued down to the days of Napoleon Bonaparte. The earliest date that can be given to its extinction is 1806, when Bonaparte overthrew the Emperor of Germany, or Austria, in whom resided this power at that time. It may, however, be doubted whether that time is the proper point at which to date its extinction, as Napoleon claimed and exercised this power as the "*successor of the Cesars.*" If then, it was continued in him, as seems most likely, it was not finally extinguished till the battle of Waterloo, 1815, which sealed the fate of Bonaparte, and put an end, as we believe, forever to the imperial Roman power. If this view of the subject be the true one, we have the first and most prominent sign of the times of the Gentiles being about to end directly before us, and in our generation. Let it not be forgotten, that the signs given us in this prophecy were to be marks of the end of Jerusalem's bondage to other nations, and the signal of the near approach and reign of David's son on David's throne.

We now proceed to inquire after the power symbolised by the moon. Let it be remembered it must be found in the old Roman earth, or land; and it must be second in magnitude to the Imperial. Thus situated, we are at no loss to designate the power, *viz*, the Mohammedan. It is remarkable, that the "Crescent"—*the increasing moon,* is the *standard* of that power. And further, that this power has held possession of Jerusalem ever since A. D. 636, with the exception of about one century that it was in the hands of the Crusaders. This power *waxed* stronger and stronger for a long period; but within the last century it has given "*signs*" of *waneing*—and what is remarkable, in about six years after the extinction of the Roman imperial power, in 1815, the Mohammedan, or Ottoman power began to wane and fall with a rapidity that made even her enemies afraid. From the commencement of the Greek revolution, 1821, a series of calamities fell upon this moon power, that marked her certain and speedy downfall. She now gives "signs" of soon being turned to blood, or, of having her light, as a ruling power, extinguished. Here, then, is another sign of the end of "the times of the Gentiles," and of the establishment of the kingdom of God.

Having thus prepared the way, we can have no hesitation in saying, that the various monarchies of Europe are the powers symbolized by "*the stars.*" Just prior to the times of the Gentiles ending, and the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, under the reign of David's son, on the throne of his father, there would be "signs in the stars"—or indications of these lesser monarchies being extinguished. Here we need hardly enter into any details. The late convulsions in Europe, though they seem at times to be at an end, proclaim, with a trumpet tongue, that this part of the prophecy is being fulfilled before our eyes, which leaves us in no doubt as to the point in earth's his-

tory which we now occupy. Every throne in Europe has been shaken within the past two years in a manner that indicates they are soon to fall, like stars from heaven, to rise no more; but more on this point as we proceed.

"And upon the earth, [*epi tes ges—in the land*—same words used in verse 23—signifying same territory ruled by sun, moon, and stars,] distress of nations, with perplexity." This prophecy is being fulfilled in the history of the nations occupying the old Roman Empire. The cause and effect of those things is next spoken of. "The sea and the waves roaring." We have no idea that this language has any reference, as a sign, to any literal commotion of the ocean; but, like the sun, moon, and stars, is a symbol which we will try to search out and apply. By turning to Isa. 17: 12, we read thus: "Wo to the multitude of *many people*, which make A NOISE *like the noise of the sea;* and to the rushing of nations that make A RUSHING *like the rushing of mighty waters!*" [That is, "the waves" of the sea.] "The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters." So the destruction of Babylon is represented by the figure of the sea coming up upon her; see Jer. 51: 42. So also of Tyrus, Ezek. 26: 3, see Psa. 93: 3, 4; and particularly Rev. 17: 15, where "many waters" are expressly declared to signify "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues."

Thus then, "the sea and the waves roaring" is a symbol of an uprising of the people, who have long been the victims of lordly, kingly, and imperial misrule and oppression. When they rise up like the waves of the sea, lashed to fury by winds, their despotic rulers will find themselves, like a time worn and dilapidated ship, unable to stand the storm; yet there may be, for a short time, a calm, but the storm will gather strength. If we cast our eyes over Europe and mark the events of the past two years, have we not beheld a rising up of the people—the multitudes? And, what has been the cry of this rising mass? Has it not been *republicanism!* Self-government? No more despots? Down with thrones! And, what is the effect of this uprising of the masses? "Men's hearts failing them for fear," &c. What men's hearts are these? Not all men's; but a specified class, viz: The great men—kings, nobles, lords, despots of every class. This is evident from what follows, which is the reason assigned for the fear, *viz:* "*For* [*gar*—a causative conjunction—*because*,] the powers of heaven [the sun, moon, and stars,] are shaken." The sea and wave-like convulsions of the people shake down those symbolic powers, and overturn them, carrying consternation and horrible fear among the tyranical dynasties of Europe, who have revolved in their political heavens so long as to think the people only lived for them, and not they for the people. And while they found the political heavens so convulsed that their power seemed ready to come to end, their hearts failed them for fear. At this moment they are far from feeling assurance of quiet: they "are like the troubled sea."

We now ask our readers, whether the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, the sea and waves roaring, are not being manifested before our eyes? And may we not know with certainty, that the times of the Gentiles are ending? Ought we not to enquire what is to come next? Or, what is before us? This, however, will be the subject of future remarks.

TRUTH ALWAYS IN HARMONY.

When our Lord stood before Pilate he made this glorious declaration: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear WITNESS UNTO THE TRUTH. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."

Truth is always in harmony; men's opinions are often discordant. That view of revelation which makes harmony must be the correct one; and the correct view of revelation will equally harmonize with the known works of God as manifested to the understanding, or reason of man. If this were not the case it would not be revelation, but the very reverse—darkness—mystery—secret.

To harmonize the Scriptures we should always remember, that there are *two agencies*—God's and man's—or *God's free grace*, or favor, and *man's free will*. In all that pertains to our deliverance from sin, and ultimate salvation, God's free favor lays the *foundation*, without which there could be no deliverance from sin and death. That foundation being laid, men must build thereon, or their free will must co-operate, else they will fail to attain unto the salvation offered. In the common affairs of life all men see and acknowledge these truths: all understand, if God had not given soil, the sun, rain, and suitable seasons, no effort of man could fill store-houses and barns: and they are equally sensible, that with these gifts of the God of providence there would still be a failure if men refuse to co-operate with God in bringing forth the fruits of the earth. The works of God and man in the common affairs of life have their counterpart in the work of salvation, or deliverence from sin, and the attaining unto eternal life: and he who does not bear this in mind will be ever erring in regard to *what is truth*, and may err fatally. There is a Covenant of Grace. God is one, and the primary party; but, in order to the full establishment of that covenant, man must become the other or second party. Each has a part to act: both are *essential* to the full accomplishment of salvation.

Dividing truth, and magnifying one part to the neglect or denial of the other, is injurious, if not fatal. This has always been the policy of the adversary. "Cast thyself down; for it is *witten*, [a truth,] He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy food against a stone." Here is an artful attempt to *magnify* God's faithfulness and care, so as to cover up the *obligation*, of the confiding party, to be always found in *the ways* of obedience. This promise of protection could only be claimed in the path of obedience to God, or in the performance of that part he has assigned us to act—in other words, God's grace and man's agency are essential and *inseparable;* and he that does not understand this and practice upon it will never attain deliverance from sin, nor gain eternal life.

We may contemplate this subject in relation to the remission of sins. The Scriptures represent, that we have remission of sins through the blood of Christ: Eph. 1: 7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace. And other texts of like import; particularly Revelations 1: 5—"Unto him that loved us and *washed* us from our sins in his own blood." Baptism, also, is represented as being "for the remission of sins;" see Luke 3: 3 Acts 2: 38, &c. Some men exalt

one of these truths to the neglect or denial of the other: at least, they so magnify one or the other, as to obscure the opposite, and thus "divide the living child," by not understanding the *object* either of Christ's blood or our baptism.

By not understanding the object of Christ's "shed blood," they magnify it into the "*paying our debts*," or "*dying in our room and stead*;" and by not understanding the design of baptism, it is made the point on which hangs all our salvation, and as the only means by which to *wash away our sins*. The blood of Christ and baptism are both important; but, we apprehend, for a very different reason from that assigned by the magnified views attached to them by those partizans of whom we are speaking. They are both important, because they are both *seals*; one on God's part, the other on our part, of the Covenant of Grace; ONE *of the promises* of which, is "REMISSION OF SINS." Does any one ask, for what did Christ come into the world? And for what did he shed his blood? The answer is—"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should BEAR WITNESS UNTO THE TRUTH." And again, "Jesus Christ was a *minister of the circumcision*, FOR THE TRUTH OF GOD, TO CONFIRM THE PROMISES made unto the fathers;" Rom. 15: 8—that is—to confirm, on God's part, the *Covenant of Grace;* for the promises made unto the fathers, referred to, were *gospel* promises, and circumcision was the seal, on the part of the fathers, of this gospel covenant; this, however, we shall not attempt to show particularly now; but we will here refer to the language of Peter, Acts 3: 25, 26. "Ye [Jews,] are the children of the prophets, and of *the covenant* [singular, *i. e. one*] which God made with our fathers, saying unto *Abraham*, and in thy seed shall *all the families of the earth be blessed*:" [surely that is the Gospel Covenant]—"unto you, [Jews] God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Here, then, it is plain what covenant and what "truth of God," Christ came to confirm. Christ died, or shed his blood, to confirm that covenant that was made with Abraham, in its now still more ample development. Thus, the Saviour saith, Mat. 26: 28, "This is my blood of the new testament, [covenant] which is shed for many, [all the families of the earth] for the remission of sins." This blood *sealed*, on God's part, the new covenant—the covenant of grace—which contained the promise of "remission of sins." This was *one* of the grand objects of Christ's coming into the world: other objects we may notice at another time. When we are baptised we set *our seal* to that covenant, and confirm our faith in the truth of all the promises God has made in that covenant; one of the first of which is, "I will be merciful unto their unrighteousness: their sins and iniquities will I remember no more," Heb. 8: 12.

Another grand object of Christ's advent is expressed in the text we have quoted from Acts 3: 26, "God having raised up [brought into the world, or raised up unto David, see Chron. 17: 11; raised up to manhood] his Son Jesus, sent him to BLESS YOU, in *turning away* every one of you from HIS INIQUITIES." God sends his Son to do what? "*Pay our debts!*" Is that the way he was to "*bless*" men? Was he sent to bless men by dying in their "*room and stead?*" No. How then, did God send him to bless men? By turning them away from their iniquities. That is the only way in which God can bless any man permanently. *Sin is a curse*—the way of sin is the way of "death" by an unchangable law of nature's God. Sin is violence done to the order infinite wisdom, goodness, and love has established; and must necessarily result in death. No sober, reflecting man doubts this, so far as his physical nature is concerned. A constant violation of our physical constitution tends certainly to dissolution, or death. The repeated and continued violation of the law of our moral nature tends to its insensibility—to brutalizing it—consequently, to its extinction, or death. We can only be blessed by being turned away from our iniquities.

What is iniquity? Every thing that is contrary to *love*: "GOD IS LOVE;" the opposite to love is opposition to God, or, is iniquity. The love which is the fulfilment of the law, relates to God and our neighbor, or fellow men. Jesus Christ is the great *example* of both. Every departure from his example is a departure from love, and hence a departure from God, who is love; and it is iniquity. Our Lord, Jesus Christ, not only taught love to God and man by precept, but example; and we are taught to "walk even as he also walked," 1 John, 2: 6.

Any violation of the principle of love—the God-like principle—tends to death or extinction of being. Do you ask how? We answer; by benumbing or deadening our moral sensibilities and searing the conscience, till the man sinks down to the state of a mere brute; governed by no other law than that of the flesh, or animal nature, which has now so completely mastered him, that, like a brute he lives; his moral nature having become so near extinct that it has no control over his animal nature, and he is "carnal, sold under sin," which, "when finished, bringeth forth death," or extinction of being—he shall "be as though he had not been." Obediah, 16:—or, "be destroyed forever," Psa. 92: 7.

On the other hand, if our moral nature predominates, and we "keep our bodies under," [See 1 Cor. 9: 27,] by patterning after the example of love set us by Christ—or, learning of him who was meek and lowly in heart—our moral nature rises—becomes the all controling power of our being; and thus we are brought to life eternal, by being turned away from our iniquity. But this life eternal is not of *debt;* it is "the *gift* of God through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

AN INQUIRY.

Jeffersonville, Ind. Oct. 8, 1849.

BROTHER STORRS,—How do you reconcile Matthew 25: 31—41, with your views of probation after the advent? I am am inquirer after truth, and am desirous of more light on this subject.

N. FIELD.

REPLY TO BR. FIELD.

If our theory, that the age of Messiah's reign, to follow the present order of things, is inconsistent with the text of which you speak, the theory of the non-resurrection of the wicked, till the end of that age, is equally irreconcileable with it. But, in our mind, Mat. 25: 31—41 indicates the entire period of Messiah's judging or ruling the world on "the throne of his glory" till he has finished

the work of judgment, by a demonstration of the equality of his government, in the reward of his followers and the destruction of his enemies; which will not be accomplished in a day or year; nor, probably, in a "thousand years." One of two things is certain to our understanding," *viz*: Either there is to be a state of trial to those "left of the nations" after the advent, or the second advent will not occur for a very long while to come. The latter we do not believe, and therefore we are shut up to the former: and if that point is not capable of demonstration, we confess we despair of demonstrating any truth of the Bible —to us nothing is clearer.

"GOG AND MAGOG."

DEAR BR. STORRS.—I have for some time had in my possession a manuscript copied from the "Hebrew Archives," which I had intended sending you for publication some time since, but neglected it until now. I have had it re-copied, thinking at this particular juncture of affairs in Europe, it would prove highly interesting to your readers, especially so as coming from a Jewish source.

Respectfully,

Philada., Oct. 25, 1849. A. B. WOOD.

Translated from the French.

THE EMPEROR OF ALL THE RUSSSIAS—GOG AND MAGOG.

Extract from a discourse delivered by Rabbi Carrillon, of the Reformed Syanagogue of Spanishtown, in the Island of Jamaica.

"There is but little ground for debate, but that the prophecy of Ezekiel, relating to Israel's last enemy, points conclusively to Russia, unless a radical change, from which, may God preserve us, takes place in the mind and in the political constitutions of Europe, we need not fear that any other nation than Russia will oppress the Hebrews. On the contrary, indeed, the Hebrews are continually making new advances in the esteem and friendship of all other people, both Christian and Mahommedan. Gog is pictured to us as a man filled with the ambition of subduing the whole world, and we do not know, in the existing state of affairs, any nation of Asia or Africa which conceives a project so bold. America is out of the question, and the power is equally balanced among the other nations of Europe, the majority of them friends of peace, they hold in horror every species of warfare and of conquests; even those who are not actuated by religion, public opinion and the arts and sciences. Russia is the single empire which has the disposition, and can command the means of undertaking a like campaign; and it is worthy of remark, that a prophecy is in vogue in Russia, its origin I know not, predicting that at a certain future period the Russians will become Lords of the Universe. True or false, this prophecy has a tendency to fortify them with courage, and of itself already bears witness into what extremities they are inclined to plunge in this gigantic struggle In addition to these, there are several other reasons which induce us to believe that Russia is the empire predicted by Ezekiel, and the chief reason is drawn from the description of the country itself. In the tenth of Genesis we find the children of Japheth to have been Gomar, Magog and Madai—Javan, Tubal, Mesech and Tiras; and the sons of Gomar, Ashkenas, and Riphoth and Togarmah—from them the Japhetical nations are descended, that is to say, the Chinese, Tartars, Greeks and Persians; the Germans of the North, Muscovites and other Sclavonian races; and these are the very people whom Ezekiel names as forming the sources, or as being the tributaries from whence Gog is to issue. In chapter 39th the Prophet says, 'turn thy face towards Gog, of the country of Magog, the prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal.' The general name of the country in Scripture is Magog, and the name of its prince is Gog; but the country itself is divided into three principalities, Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal. The Prophet afterwards tells us that the prince described will be accompanied with a powerful army, composed of divers nations, of the same names as those which are mentioned in Genesis, as being descendants of Japhet and Gomar; and the most of these nations the subjects, or allies of the prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal, are represented to us as coming from Northern countries. We remark that the name of Rosh is not to be met with anywhere among the sons of Japhet. We know, however, that the first Czar of Great Muscovie was called Rosh, and that it was from him the empire derived the name it now bears. We know also that in former times Russia was divided into three independent States—Russia proper, or, according to some authors, Muscovie in Europe—Muscovy proper, or Russia eastern and southern—and Tobolsk, or northern Russia. The three States were finally united under the common name of Russia, and they held in subjection several nations of the Tartar and Sclavonian origin. Persia itself may be considered as a dependency of Russia, or the Emperor of these three States united of Rushy, Muscovy and Tobolsky, this being the true pronunciation, and of the tributary and independent countries, is called in Scripture Gog, and his empire Magog. It is very probable this name has been given to the State because the population descends in a great measure from Magog, and Gog seems to be an abbreviation of the name of Magog, and is applicable to the chiefs of this empire. The names of the three States that compose this empire are mentioned in Scripture word for word—'Son of man, turn thy face towards Gog, of the country of Magog, the Prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal;" Rosh is *Russia*—Mesheck *Muscovy*—and Tubal Tobolsky. Another combining circumstance is, that no other country is made up of so many other different nations. The prophet further tells us that these diverse nations which will march under the colors of Russia, will be armed after the fashion of the ancients, with shields, bows and arrows, and with javelins and lances, for as we are aware, notwithstanding her wide extent, Russia cannot raise an army exceeding 5 or 600,000 men in number, who are drilled according to the tactics of modern warfare, while the great mass of her troops still use arms of various kinds of darts, which were only in use among the ancients. Under still another aspect, the prophecy may be applied to Russia. It is, moreover, foretold, that of a sudden

such revolts will burst forth from the numberless army of Gog, that, using the expression of the prophet, *every man's hand will be raised against his brother*. This portion of the prophecy is eminently applicable to Russia; for it is almost certain that Russia, engaged in a universal war, on the first reverse will witness Poland and all the portions she holds under the yoke turning their arrows against her. It is thus almost established by evidence, that Russia is the country of Magog, and that Nicholas or one of his successors is the Gog announced by the prophet, and that there is reason to believe that the latter days are not far off; let us, therefore, be on the watch and in continual prayer, that we may not be overwhelmed by a torrent of events, as a thief taken in the night!"

LETTERS.

BR. R. L. PATRIDGE writes :—

Marysville, Ohio, Oct. 9th, 1849.

BRO. STORRS,—For the edification of ourselves and the furtherance of the cause of Christ, we trouble you again for books. Our brethren in the distance have persuaded us out of those volumes of Dobney that we received, even before we had read them, and consequently we now send for more. I am very sorry that my present circumstances will not permit me to make a donation to the Examiner; but you may look for a subscription from me and some others for the next volume at $1.

BR. JOHN HUTCHINSON writes :—

Oshkosh, Wis., Oct. 7th, 1849.

BR. STORRS,—I would say for your encouragement, that through your Six Sermons and Dobney on Future Punishment one Congregational Minister, John Ingersal, in Milwaukie, has been brought into the truth. He has preached two sermons on "No immortality out of Christ." Truth is at work on this great and important subject in this region I believe, with you, in the return of the Jews and probation after Christ sets up his everlasting kingdom. To me these truths are as clear as the sun at noon-day.

HENRI ST. CLAIR writes :—

Lafayette. Ia., Oct. 8th, 1849.

MR. STORRS—*Dear Sir* :—Enclosed you will find two dollars, the amount due you for one copy of "Dobney," five copies of Six Sermons, and Bible Examiner for 1848 and '49. I am very much pleased with the Examiner. It has thrown a light on some passages of the Bible, and altogether strengthened my belief and faith. Myself and wife have been believers in the doctrines [*of the Bible*] as taught by you for more than three years;—not without opposition you may well believe;—we have read the Examiner faithfully, and I trust with some profit. I have circulated your Sermons, since I received them, to the best of my ability, and I think the truth is spreading; people are investigating the subject. You may count on me for the *subscription* for *three copies* of the Examiner from the beginning of volume three. I do sincerely hope that you will be able to sustain the paper.

BR. N. BOND writes :—

Cleaveland, Ohio, Oct. 7th, 1849.

BR. STORRS :—I have read the Examiner a part of the time since its first publication; but moving from place to place, I have not seen all you have published—but have read sufficient, comparing it with the word of God, to fully establish the truth to my mind that the great principle you are endeavoring to establish and defend in the Examiner (*viz:* the doctrine of life and death,) with kindred doctrines are second to none taught in the word of God, and show to my mind most clearly the wisdom, benevolence and justice of God. The personal reign of Christ with his Saints on the earth is a doctrine which stands out very prominent and clear in the word of God. I have been a confirmed believer since 1840 that the Kingdom of God was near, even at the *door*. The great battle I believe is commenced; and events will thicken and hasten until no doubt will be left. As a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the earth.

DR. N. FIELD writes :—

Jeffersonville, Ind., Oct. 8, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—We are much pleased with the Examiner, and wish you success in its publication. I hope it will be liberally patronized and that it will become the organ of a growing and intelligent body of people scattered abroad who are advocating the true doctrine of immortality. It should be made a medium of an interchange of views, around which the friends of truth should rally. The principles we advocate are rapidly extending.

EXAMINER FOR 1850.—Our friends will please bear in mind that one number more completes the present volume. We have decided on continuing the paper another year; but we shall adhere to our terms of *payment in all cases in advance*. If any, therefore, do not receive the Examiner for January, 1850, they will understand the reason is—we have not received the subscription price for it. We invite all our present subscribers to continue their favors to us. Agents should not fail to remit money in their hands before January. The following pledges have been made to the Examiner for 1850, since our October issue:

Henry F. Johnson, New York,	$5,00
J. B Frisbie, Sylvan, Mich.,	5,00
Henry Grew, Philadelphia,	8,00
Wm. Mayell, Albany, N. Y.,	3,00

BUSINESS NOTICES.—For PRICE of books see the Examiner for October.

Br. Joseph Cherry 462 Washington St., New York, is acting as Agent in the sale of Dobney on Future Punishment.

Br. C. Swartwout, Utica, N. Y., is Agent for the Examiner in that city, and has for sale Dobney--our Six Sermons, and the Christian Psalmody.

Dr. Perkins, Albany, N. Y., has Dobney and the Christian Psalmody for sale, and will act in receiving subscriptions for the Examiner.

Br. Henry Grew, of this city, has published a new edition of his pamphlet "On the Intermediate State of the Dead"—a very valuable work, of 24 pages, 12mo. Price, five cents single copy, or $3 per hundred. He can now supply any amount ordered.

Br. Henry Heyes wishes us to say, that his Post Office address is Springfield, Mass.; CARE of R. E Ladd.

All orders for Walsh's Review of Luther Lee must be addressed to John T. Walsh, 63 Ogden St., Philadelphia. Price 25 cents, or five copies for $1.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER, 1849. No. 12.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE SON OF GOD—NO. VI.

BY HENRY GREW.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE SON OF GOD, AS A DISTINCT BEING FROM THE FATHER.

It is indeed revealed that Christ and his Eather are one, John 5: 30, but it is no where revealed that the Father and Son are *one being*. In the very next verse preceding the declaration, 'I and my Father are one,' Jesus said, 'My Father—is greater than all.' Jesus also prayed, John 17: 21, that his disciples 'may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us.'

Do not all those passages which declare that 'Christ came down from heaven:' '*from God;*' that the Father *sent* him, evidently imply that he was a *distinct being* in that very highest character in which only he existed 'with God' in heaven, before he 'came down from heaven?' If the Spirit of truth has used the language of mortals, in the sense it is invariably used and understood by mortals, can these passages fail to produce the conviction, that he who 'came down from heaven,' 'from God,' who was *sent by the Father*, was, and is a distinct being from the Father who sent him? Is it possible to conceive of the *Son* coming down from heaven, rather than the *Father*, if they are both the 'same numerical essence?' Or, is it possible to conceive of the Word being 'made flesh,' rather than the Father, if we conceive of both as one being?

It has been suggested by a late able writer, that the passages which speak of God's *sending* his Son, &c., are to be understood as referring to the Father's sending him *after he was born of the virgin*, to execute the mediatorial office. The scriptural representation is, that the Father sent him 'into the world,' John 3: 17, &c. Besides, if the opinion of that writer is correct, that Christ, as the *Son of God*, did not exist previous to the incarnation, we certainly must never expect to read of any character inferior to the supreme God, *coming down from heaven.*'

Let us now attend to the 'faithful witness.' John 4: 38, For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. John 4: 33, For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. John 8: 42, I proceeded forth, and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. John 13: 3, Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God. John 16: 38, I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father. Well did his disciples say, 'Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb.'

Heb. 5: 5. Wherefore, when he *cometh* into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a BODY has thou prepared me,' &c, 'A BODY has thou prepared me.' Not a body and *another spirit or soul*. 'The Word was made flesh.' This is the divine testimony on this important subject. The common opinion, that the Son of God took another 'reasonable soul' is sustained by no declaration of the Bible. 'The first born of every creature,' the 'first begotten' was a spirit, 'the image of the invisible God.' This spirit, or Word, was made flesh, i. e. united to the body 'prepared' for him, and, in connection therewith, humbled himself, was 'made like unto his brethren.' He became susceptible of our feelings and infirmities, was tempted in all points as we are, but without sin, that he might know how to succor them that are tempted. That it was possible for the Son of God incarnate thus to humble himself and to be qualified to sympathize with us, as our faithful High Priest, without assuming an additional spirit of the human nature; and that the assumption of a human body in connection with such humiliation of spirit furnishes adequate ground for his being called man, the Son of man, &c., no one can reasonably deny. 7. Then, said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) *to do thy will, O God.* How plain and forcible is this divine testimony! Is not the last quoted declaration of Christ, represented as being *previous* to his actually being in the flesh? Was it not the declaration of the *Word* that 'was with God,' and 'was made flesh?' And is it not the language of *inferiority and subjection?* Here are *two distinct wills* spoken of *before the incarnation*. The will of the *Son*, in subjection to the will of the *Father*. Could the 'Word' in truth say, '*I come* to do *thy will*, O God,' rather than his own: or could he afterwards sav, '*I came down from heaven*, not to do mine own will,' if his will was *the same numerical will* with that of the Father? Surely, then, we are plainly taught in the unerring word of truth, that he who came down from heaven to do the will of God, was and is, in his highest character, a *distinct being* from him whose will he voluntarily came to do.

John 17: 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. Is not the glory, which Christ here prayed for, and for which, consequently, he acknowledges his dependence on the Father, the glory of his *highest nature?* This is certainly the case; for in his highest nature only did he exist 'before the world was.' But if the Word was *ever* dependent on the Father for his highest glory, he must have been *always* dependent; for supreme independence is *immutable*. This prayer of Jesus Christ, therefore, proves that the Word is a *distinct being* from the Father. After this prayer was an-

swered, and Jesus glorified with the same glory he had with the Father before the world was, he is still distinguished from God in the following passages: Rom. 1: 7; 1 Cor. 1: 3; 11: 3; 1 Thes. 3: 11; 2 Thes. 3: 5; 2: 16, &c.

2 Cor. 8: 9. For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though *he was rich*, yet for your sakes he *became poor*, &c. Here the inspired apostle refers to the glory of the Son of God before he was made flesh. Moved with compassion for us, he laid aside his glory; '*he became poor*.' Surely this cannot, in any sense, be applicable to the *immutable* Jehovah.

1 Cor. 8: 6. 'But to us there is but ONE GOD, THE FATHER, *of* whom are all things, and we in him; and *one Lord Jesus Christ*, BY whom are all things, and we by him.' Here we are plainly taught, not only that there is but one God, but that this one God is 'THE FATHER.' Alas! we have still to say with the apostle, 'Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge;' for some with conscience say to us, the Father alone, is not the one God. The one God, is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Here, then, are two different testimonies concerning the one living and true God. And which shall we believe? The one inspired by the Holy Ghost; or that which is declared by fallible men? Is there a single passage of Scripture which declares that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God? Or that there are three persons in the Godhead? Or that the Father alone is not the one God? The text in 1 John 5: 7, (if it were not an interpolation,) does not declare either expressly or impliedly, that the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost are one God, or one being, or one person, or three persons, but simply 'these three are one.' In what sense they are one, must certainly be determined by the text and other passages of Scripture. The text itself tells us they are one in their '*record*,' or testimony—the agreement is perfect. How plainly is the one Lord Jesus Christ 'BY whom are all things,' distinguished from the one God, 'OF whom are all things.' And how perfectly does this harmonize with other parts of the divine testimony. 'God who created all things BY Jesus Christ.' Eph, 3: 9. By him he saves sinners, and manifests the glory of his grace, 'to the principalities and powers in the heavealy places.' Eph. 3: 10. By him he will judge the world. Acts 17: 31; Eph. 4: 5, 6. Here again, the 'one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all,' is distinguished from the 'one Lord.'

Col. 1: 15, 16. Who is the *image* of the invisible God, *the first born of every creature*; for by him were all things created, &c. Christ Jesus was the *image* of God, in his *highest nature*, for as such he created the world. Does not this expression teach us that he is a distinct being from the Father? Would the declaration, that a being is *the image of himself*, convey any intelligible idea to the mind? Is the word ever so used? Is not every image a representation of *a distinct object*? Is it not the likeness of *another thing*? If the Scriptures revealed that the Son is the invisible God, would the apostle have said, he is the *image or likeness* of the invisible God? When one person bears a striking resemblance to another, we sometimes say, he who has seen one has seen the other. So did our Saviour say, 'he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father;' and with the greatest propriety; for 'God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of his glory *in the face of Jesus Christ*.'

'*The first born of every creature*.' The apostle proves that the Son of God is 'the first born of every creature,' by his creating all things. His argument is conclusive; for if 'God created all things by Jesus Christ,' Jesus Christ must have existed 'before all things.' The passage also proves that he was the first born of every creature, *when* he created all things, otherwise, the latter could be no proof of the former. If we refer the phrase 'first born of every creature,' to his *humanity*, it makes the apostle argue very absurdly, that Jesus Christ is a man because he made all things. It is conceived that every unbiased mind must perceive that the apostle has as much reference to the highest nature of Christ when he declares him to be *the first born of every creature*, as when he declares, that 'by him were all things created.' And we may as well say, it was his humanity that created all things, as to say, it was his humanity that was the first born of every creature. When it is said, that by him *all things* were created, it is manifest that he himself is excepted, who is "*the only begotten* of the Father,' and 'the beginning of the creation of God.' Rev. 3: 14.

John 17: 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, *the only true God* and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Does not 'the faithful witness' here plainly distinguish between himself, and 'the only true God?' If Jesus Christ is the only true God, and man in one person, has he in this passage borne witness to the *truth*? Jude 4. Denying the *only Lord God*, and our Lord Jesus Christ. Here also our Saviour is distinguished from the *only* Lord God. John 7: 17. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. John 14: 1. Ye believe in God, believe also in me. Rom. 1: 7. Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Titus 2: 13. Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. The Scriptures assure us that the second coming of Christ will be attended with the manifestation of the '*glory of his Father*,' as well as the glory of the Son, and of the holy angels. Matt. 16: 27, Rom. 16: 27. To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen. Heb. 12: 23, 24. To God the Judge of all—and to Jesus the mediator, &c. 1 Tim. 2: 5. For there is one God, and one mediator *between* God and men, the man Christ Jesus. Rev. 1: 9. For the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. Rev. 5: 13. Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. If Jesus Christ or the Lamb, is the very same being that sitteth upon the throne, is not the last clause superfluous and without meaning? Rev. 19: 13—16. Here our Saviour is called the 'Word of God,' the 'King of kings and Lord of lords.' Are not these titles descriptive of his *very highest character*? Yet this King of kings and Lord of lords, this Word of God, is plainly distinguished in the 15th verse from the 'ALMIGHTY God.' While we give to the Son of God the glory due to his name; let us receive his own testimony, that the Father is 'the only true God;' 'for of him, and through him, and to him, are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen.'

"This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

DEFINITION OF WORDS.

Br. Storrs,—Perhaps it might be productive of good and destructive of evil, to publish, in the Bible Examiner, a few words used in Scripture; a derivative of one, destructive, I have just written. It comes from the word *destroy*, (Latin, *destruo*,) which signifies to *demolish*, to ruin, to annihilate, by demolishing or burning, to bring to nought, to lay waste, to make desolate, to kill, to slay, to extirpate; to take away, to put an end to, to cause to cease; to eat, to devour, to consume; to resolve a body into its parts or elements. "All the wicked will God destroy." Apply the meaning of the word to the wicked, and can there be either root or branch of them left? What say ye, my friends, who so rigidly adhere to *baptizo*?

Consume, (Latin, *consumo*,) to destroy, by separating the parts of a thing, by decomposition, as by fire, by eating, devouring, and annihilating the form of a substance. Fire consumes wood, coal, *stubble, hay, tares;* to bring to utter ruin; to exterminate. What becomes of the wicked when they are consumed? Psalm 37: "The wicked shall perish—they shall consume."

Devour, (Latin, *devoro*,) to eat up, to destroy or consume with rapidity and violence; to slay. To destruction the devil is doomed. "Art thou come to *destroy* us before the time?" Christ will destroy him that hath power over death, that is, the devil. Hence the malignity of the devil, in endeavoring to involve man in his ruin,—"Seeking whom he may devour." 1 Pet. v. 8.

Destruction, (Latin, *destructio*,) the act of destroying, demolition; death, murder, slaughter, massacre, annihilation, *eternal death*. Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction. Matt. 7. Will the lovers of *baptizo* look critically at these words, and understand impartially and hermeneutically while they look?

Perish, (Latin, *pereo*, from *per* and *eo*, to depart wholly,) to die, to be destroyed, to come to nothing; to be extirpated, to waste away—to be burnt, &c.—swift destruction. 2 Peter ii. 12. "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and *destroyed*, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and *shall utterly perish* in their own *corruption*." Are there any *baptizers* among this class, destined to a *destruction, utterly, wholly?*

Perdition, (from Latin, *perditio*—or Greek, *Pertho*)—entire loss—utter destruction—eternal death. What say ye? Can you perceive any symptoms of life in those who are utterly destroyed—dead, eternally dead—perished, utterly, wholly perished!

Death, (Saxon.) That state in which all 'vital functions and feelings cease, when every organ has ceased to act, and has lost all susceptibility of renewed action,'—the state of the dead; destroyer, or agent of death. Rev. ii. 23: "I will kill her children with death"—the second death—eternal death. "The wages of sin is *death*." This is according to the judgment of God, how much soever it varies from the presumptuous judgment of men.

Is it necessary to define the word *die!* "The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*"—to be deprived of life; to cease to live, to expire, to decease, to perish; to be punished with death, or to lose life for a crime, —to come to an end,—to perish everlastingly—to be dead eternally—to die to sin, is to be dead to sin. 1 Cor. xv.—I die daily. But strange to say, some there are who positively declare, that the wicked will live eternally! God says they shall die—that they are worthy of death—that they are vessels of wrath 'fitted for destruction'—that they shall utterly perish; that they shall be destroyed—doomed to everlasting destruction—the second death. This is the judgment of God. This is what is more fully revealed than immersion. What think ye, O ye lovers of the word baptizo? Will ye need more words? When we speak of the poet's fire, as did Pope, we use the word *fire*, a *metaphor*, for genius, and have no idea whatever that by poet's fire is implied a fire of coals, or hickory, or blackjack, &c. So everlasting fire is metaphorically used for eternal death, or everlasting death. Fire here, too, is a metaphor, and implies not genius, nor material fire, but *destruction*. There is not in this world a book so pregnant with figurative language as the Bible, though we often hear of its sublime simplicity. If by simplicity is meant a total exemption from affectation, this quality it justly claims. It abounds, nevertheless, in imagery of every description. That amazing error of the Romish church, transubstantiation, is only rhetoric turned into logic, that is, understanding in their literal sense, expressions manifestly figurative. "What a world of calamity," says John Quincy Adams, "this single blunder has brought upon mankind. Yet the same kind of mistakes have laid the foundation of almost all the schisms in the Christian church, and many of the bloodiest wars between Christian nations."—*Adams' Lectures*, Vol. 2, page 349—Edition printed in the year 1810.

But do the advocates of the eternal life in misery of the wicked truly understand figurative language, or do they require more words to prove the destruction of the wicked, than is required to establish any other tenet of the Christian system? Do they understand words hermeneutically, according to the sacred canon, as well as the canons of just criticism? The wrath of God is that punishment which the Righteous Judge will inflict upon the finally wicked, when they shall be judged by Jesus Christ according to the gospel. What is the punishment, according to the gospel? They that have sinned without law, *shall perish* without law. Those who have the law and the gospel, know the judgment of God, that they who are guilty of such things, are worthy of *death*. There is not a problem in Euclid's Elements more clearly proved, than is the destruction of the wicked. So indelible is the impression made, by the force of evidence, scripture evidence, on my mind, relative to the certainty of that punishment being death, that all reasoning from figurative language, such as the advocates of immortal soulism employ, dwindle away into something more loathing than puerility and insignificance. And while I hate and abhor that which is evil; while I am constrained to believe that imbecility of mind is not unfrequently connected with malignity of heart, I regret and deplore the profusion of prejudice and abundance of malice expended by some who oppose the doctrine we believe.

But so it is—so it has been—and so it will be to the end. They hated me, says Jesus, without a cause. Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life. Ye will not believe me, because I tell you the truth. Am I, says the apostle, therefore

become your enemy because I tell you the truth? Is there not a striking likeness between many professors of religion in our day, and those scribes and and pharisees of old? But of this the Lord is judge, and will judge at the appointed day. There are several words besides those mentioned that claim the attention of the Bible student. Nay, it is necessary to understand the import of every word, if possible, so as to have a perfect, thorough knowledge of what we read.

In hope of eternal life at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ,

I am, *dear brother*, yours,

I. F. Lee.

Meltonsville, N. C., 1849.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

EPHESIANS, CHAPTERS V. AND VI.

Verse 21: "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God."

"Submitting"—the original has not merely the ordinary idea of submission, but *arranging*—"yourselves one to another"—each individual occupying that position in "the body" that is fitting and proper for the harmony and usefulness of the whole; that there be no collisions and discord. The hand should submit to the foot, and the foot to the hand; each is equally important in its place; and they are to arrange themselves to each other, and neither assume the office or work of the other: that would be indeed unseemly, and out of place; therefore, all *arrange* "*yourselves* one to another in the fear"—in reverence—"of God;" or, as some Greek Testaments read—*Christou*—Christ. Christ is the head of the church; but "the head of Christ is God." All rule, authority, and order proceeds from God, through Christ, into his church—his body; therefore, in reverence for the source from whence it emanates, let every member of the body arrange themselves one to another, so as to accomplish the design of the originator.

Verse 22.—"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord."

"Wives submit"—*arrange* "yourselves unto your own husbands"—occupying that place in reference to them designed by him who instituted the relation—"as unto the Lord;" because he has ordained the relation and its duties: hence, a departure from the relation or duties of it, is a departure from the Lord. Let those wives think of this, who pretend to such holiness or dignity as to be above thus arranging themselves to their own husbands, according to God's order. Such fancied holiness and dignity only shows them not to be "daughters of Sarah, who obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord:" 1 Pet. 3: 5, 6.

Verse 23.—"For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Saviour of the body."

This verse shows what God's established order is: "The husband is the head"—*kephale*—signifies one to whom another is subordinate—"of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church"—that is the rule of subordination—and the relation itself was designed to symbolize Christ and his church—"and he is the Saviour—*soter*—preserver, deliverer, one who saves from danger, &c.,—"of the body"—the church: such is the husband to the wife, after the manner of Christ to the church.

Verse 24.—"Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing."

This verse scarce needs any remark—it is plain and explicit. If any difficulty arise upon it, it would be in the expression, "in every thing"—*en panti*—all, whole, total, entire, universal. The language in the translation is no stronger than in the original; and it is in vain to attempt to evade it. Any woman that does not intend to regard this injunction sins in being married at all. When married, if she is determined she will not regard it, let her first renounce all pretensions to Christianity; and especially not be guilty of the hypocrisy of claiming superior holiness.

If she thinks herself in danger in such a position, let her seek to make her husband a holy man; not by force, or attempting to live in disobedience to the injunction in this verse, but by showing her husband, that though she sometimes feels herself aggrieved, yet she bears it patiently, in obedience to God, and in hope of his salvation; for, if he can be brought to obey the gospel, she is safe from any real harm by him: because, that Gospel commands—

Verse 25.—"Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it."

What could be said more, or stronger. If wives owe subjection to their husbands, husbands owe a *love* to their wives of the strongest and highest character, "*even as* Christ also loved the church." And, how did he love the church? So much that he "gave *himself* for it,"—gave himself to deprivation, suffering, and death itself, when it was necessary for his church.

Verses 26, 27.—"That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing: but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Here we are taught not only how much Christ loved the church, but to what end that love was directed in all that it led him to suffer for it. First, "That he might sanctify"—separate, consecrate—that he might *separate* it from all others, as a wife is separated unto her husband alone—*consecrating* it to himself, as the partner of his glory; in order to which he designed to "cleanse it"—*katharisas*—free it from sin, or make pure—"with the washing of water by the word" of truth: [see John 17: 17.] "That he might present it to himself [as a bride, and fitting partner of his glory to be revealed] a glorious church, not having spot"—stain; any impurity—"or wrinkle"—fault, defect, blemish, vice: no marks of *decay*, or waxing old; for it is designed to bloom in immortal youth—"or any such thing:" intending its entire renewal and deliverance, and full participation in his glory, incorruptibility, and endless life. Such were the objects of Christ's love to his church.

Verses 28, 29.—"So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh: but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church."

The expression "ought," in this text, is very emphatic and expressive. It imports that it is a *debt* the husband owes his wife, and which he is

under obligation to discharge; and that it is fit, proper and incumbent on him that he discharge it. Without doing this he has no claim to being a Christian; and, by implication, hates himself. He is, therefore, to nourish and cherish his wife after the pattern of the Lord to the church.

VERSE 30.—"For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."

This verse is peculiar in its construction. The question may naturally arise—Does the Apostle speak this of the relation of the church to Christ? or, of wives to their husbands? If of the first, it is, of course, spoken mystically: that is—it relates to that secret spiritual union that exists between Christ and his church. Though it may have that application, yet the connection and the verse itself seems to require the application to the relation of wives to their husbands. In the first place, the pronoun "*we*," in this verse, is not in the original text; and the Apostle is assigning reasons why men ought to love their wives. Suppose we substitute the pronoun *they*, for *we*, and understand "*his body*" to signify the husband's body. Paul had said men ought to love their wives as their own bodies—that men do not hate their own flesh, but nourish and cherish it: love your wives, therefore —"For"—*oti*—because, or seeing that [they] "are members of"—*ek*—out of his [the husband's] body, of"—*ek*—out "of his flesh, and of"—*ek*—out "of his bones." The reference here is manifestly to the creation of woman, Gen. 2: 21—24. It is true there is a grammatical difficulty in this construction of the verse, but perhaps not greater than often occurs. We pass it, however, to notice the conclusion the Apostle draws from it.

VERSE 31.—"For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."

This is a literal quotation from Gen. 2: 24, and shows what the Apostle had in his mind in the previous verse. We are now prepared for the use made of this union and relation in the next verse.

VERSE 32.—"This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church."

"The mystery! This is great. I speak for Christ and for his church." Such is a literal translation of this verse. The Apostle here informs us that the creation of man and woman was designed, *obscurely* at first, to be a representation of a union that God intended, at a future period, to develope between Christ, the second Adam, and those redeemed from among men, who would be made partakers of a spiritual nature; becoming *one with Christ*, by partaking of him the quickening spirit; and as the woman partook of man's body, flesh and bones, thus becoming *one flesh* with man, so those who partake of the divine and spiritual nature of Christ, become with him *one spirit*—he is the head; they are his body; both at length made *immortal. incorruptible*, and endowed with "*endless life*." Thus whatever Christ has, possesses, or enjoys, they have, possess and enjoy: they are are truly the "Bride, the Lamb's Wife." High, holy and glorious is her calling. Let her see to it that she is truly obedient, and faithful to her Lord, now so soon to return to take his bride to himself.

VERSE 33.—"Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

Though the Apostle had thus spoken for Christ and for his church, yet he abates nothing from the exhortation to husbands and wives. Our attention is next called to the relation and duties of children and parents. Here we may be allowed to remark, that, God has established *order* in all his works; and every thing in its place and proper order, so as to avoid all collision or clashing; and each part is so dependent upon the other parts, that no part can be out of place, without injury to the whole: hence, it is for the interest and happiness of all to know their place, and walk in it: and it is the duty of all who would teach true religion, to teach those duties, and enforce the obligation on all to fulfil them. God is the head of all authority and power, and is the "head of Christ." Christ is head over all things to his church, by the appointment of God. The man is the head of the woman. The parents are the head of their children. All is beauty and harmony, so long as this order is not disturbed by any refusing to act their assigned part. Hence the Apostle proceeds—

CHAPTER VI., VERSES 1 to 3.—"Children obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and thy mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth."

"Children obey"—listen to, hearken to, attend to, yield to, submit to—"your parents, in the Lord"—your parents are such by God's appointment; and he having caused you to have those, your regard for, or disregard of them, tests your regard for, or disregard of God. Nothing is clearer, than that the child who lightly esteems its parent, or refuses subjection, is destitute of true piety. No matter what the character of that parent is, nor how much the traditions of men may assert the contrary. How many professed ministers and religious fanatics have taught children, like the Pharisees of old, for their religious or sectarian purposes, to disregard parents and their authority, and the duty they owe them; but, Paul teaches to obey parents "is right"—that which is right, or just: and he adds—"Honor"—prize, esteem, value, respect—"thy father and mother; which is the first command with promise." This is truly remarkable. The first duty God requires of children is subjection and reverence for those who, under him, gave them being. Children, for several years, are incapable of knowing any higher authority than that of parents; and the first command, with promise, to them is, obey—honor thy parents. The command and promise are alike suited to the capacity of the child in the first state of developing intellect. "That it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest live long on the earth." The original promise was at the giving the law at Mount Sinai, soon after Israel left Egypt for the land promised to their fathers; a most desirable inheritance; though only typical of a higher and more perfect land to be inherited; even the new earth, yet to be revealed. The best and most obedient children sometimes die young; but God's promise does not fail to them; for, if they have obeyed this command, the promise will be fulfilled in endless life, on the new earth. God's promises never fail; and his power secures the fulfilment, to the letter, of those that may seem most unlikely to be accomplished. If children refuse obedience to parents, having failed in the first step of doing the will of God, they forfeit all claim to eternal life at the

outset. Let them remember this solemn truth; and watch, as for eternal life, that they may, under every trial and temptation, yield reverence and obedience to their parents, which will secure for them, in after life, should they live, an easy path in yielding that obedience to God, in all things, so essential to their happiness, or its being "*well* with them;" and which will result, assuredly, in *immortality, incorruptibility, endless life.*

VERSE 4.—"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

We here come to the duties of parents to their children. "Fathers"—by implication, both parents—"provoke not your children"—stir them not up—excite them not—"to wrath." Many parents wonder why their children are so petulent, and soon angry. They have not seen the "beam in their own eye." If parents deal angrily, and in passion with their children, they may expect to reap anger and passion in return. For what parents sow, that shall they also reap. If they sow anger, strife, and discord between themselves, and among their offspring, they may expect a crop of the same. The law of God and of nature requires this. If men "sow to the wind they will reap the whirlwind." The great secret of so many bad and disobedient children is, one or both parents were lacking in self-government: they ruled in anger, and begat in the minds of their children such an image as they themselves exhibited. Little do most parents think of the wrong they are inflicting on their offspring, by the tempers they manifest in the management of them. To their hands is committed the moulding of the minds of their children: a solemn—an awful responsibility rests upon them: they, most likely, will give that mould or turn to their minds which will lead to death eternal, or result in immortality, incorruptibility, and endless life. How proper, then, the charge to parents we have just contemplated: and how equally important that which follows: "But bring them up"—nourish, educate—"in the nurture"—instruction, information, teaching, or discipline—"and admonition"—reproof, censure—"of the Lord"—with such nourishment and discipline as God has appointed; and *for* the Lord. Our children are not ours, except to nourish and bring up for the Lord: and they are treasures belonging to God, for which he will call us to account to know what we have done with and for them. Let parents realize this and they will feel less concern to make their children what is called "*respectable*" in the world. If they are trained up as God directs, he will see that they have all the respectability that will be for their safety, or real happiness. Let parents seek, then, to make their children what God requires they should be, first of all.

THE WOMAN IN THE WILDERNESS.

The following communication we have received from a native of Wales. It is deeply interesting, whatever may be thought of the correctness of the interpretation, which may be as good, and it does seem better than most we have seen:

MR. EDITOR:—As an enquirer into the truth of the prophetic Scriptures, I would be obliged to you if you will publish the following remarks on the 12th chapter of Revelation, which has hitherto been a blank in all comments on the Bible, inasmuch as it has been considered a repetition of the same subject treated in the 11th chapter, under other symbols.

I apprehend that the 11th chapter contains an exhibition of the state of believers under the dominion of the beast and his horns, but that the 12th is a prophetic declaration that "the church," par excellence, should escape from her enemies and obtain protection under the wing of some power not in league with the beast, where she should be nourished and fed during a time, times and half a time, from the face of the serpent. That was the period assigned to the beast and his horns, during all of which the church was to be preserved in that wilderness.

Now, by "wilderness" I do not understand a wilderness state, as do the commentators, which means a state of formality and indifference; there would have been no need of wings to attain such a state: and besides, it is said that it was a place which God had prepared for the church: and God did not prepare a place for the church in formality and indifference, or obscurity, as others say. The church was not obscure; for, the enemy saw her, and sent a flood of water after her; and when the earth helped her, and she had escaped to her place, he knew where she was, for he was wroth at her, and turned to make war with the Remnant of her Seed, who still continued in those regions whence the church had escaped.

The question now is, what wild country of Europe has nourished and fed the true church of our Redeemer during the time of popery? And this nourishing and feeding means much more than toleration at times, and bitter persecution at others; as was the case under the Dukes of Savoy, in whose dominions the Vaudois were found.

There is no country in Europe but Wales where unrestrained liberty of conscience was allowed. The national motto being "The truth against the world:" and the Druidical priests taught their followers "that it *was the duty of all men to seek after the truth, and to receive it against the whole world.*" And this was understood to imply the most perfect right and duty of all men to choose for themselves in religious matters. Accordingly there is not an instance on record of any man being put to death or molested in person or property in Wales during their state of independence, which continued till the year 1544, the 35th of Henry the VIII.; which was more than 10 years after he renounced the Pope's authority.

When the Welsh submitted to the crown of England, in the reign of Edward the First, it was as an independent principality, under a charter like the American Colonies; but when Wales was united to England, in the year above named, the ancient laws were set aside; and in the reign of Mary three persons suffered martyrdom in Wales under the operation of the English laws, which was the only martyr's blood shed there since the reign of Dioclesian, when a few persons suffered in that part of Wales which was subject to the Romans.

Now according to the prophecy we are to look where it was that papal Rome was to make its first essay at persecuting the pure church; for that was the place of the church's refuge.

There had been persecutions under the Christian

profession; for the orthodox Emperors persecuted the heterodox, and these in return persecuted the orthodox; but these were deficient in their character, neither of them having the marks of the true church—and neither fled into the wilderness for preservation.

We are told that when Austin, the Pope's legate, had brought the Saxons, or one of the Saxon kingdoms, to the Roman Catholic system, he tried to bring over the primitive churches in Wales, about three hundred in number, to the same way; but they refusing, he brought upon them the Saxon kings, who destroyed their greatest college, killed upwards of 1100 of its inmates, and intended to destroy the whole church, but the Welsh princes and the prince of Cornwall, uniting their forces, they overthrew the Saxons with great slaughter, and drove the king of Northumberland over the river Humber. These affairs happened about the year 603 according to some writers, and in 605 according to others; while some place them as late as 607. They occurred, however, at a time near enough to identify them as the sending of the flood of water out of the serpent's mouth; for that occurred at the commencement of the prophetic period of 1260 years, as the Pope had his power finally confirmed in 606 by Phocas. These occurrences seem to fix the principal era of popery at 606.

From the beginning of the fifth to the close of the ninth century, persons who were persecuted by the pagans and papists of the surrounding countries fled to Wales. The last great company came from the south of Scotland in 895; after that but few came in, as the stock of primitive Christians failed. In the year 750 there were 462 churches of the primitive order in Wales, all endowed with land by the princes and lords of Wales. There were also about 12 seminaries for education, which would now be called colleges.

Notwithstanding the prevalence of Christianity, the majority of the princes and nobles and poets of Wales coutinued *pagan* till Wales became subject to the English crown, and sacrifices were regularly offered till late in the 12th century, a period of 1100 years from the first introduction of the Gospel in 63. So here was a power, in which the *pagan* interest was predominant, protecting the pure church of our Lord.

The surrounding Roman Catholic nations had a terrible spite against the church in Wales. For many centuries they waged most bloody wars with a view to destroy it. Every part of the country was traversed at different times by hostile armies, burning churches and colleges, time and again. And so numerous were these armies after England became united under Egbert that old writers say, that had not God had some special design in preserving the Welsh, they would have become extinct long ago: but they preserved the truth of the Gospel during the Beast's reign. They planted primitive Christianity and civil and religious liberty in more than one of the British colonies in America, and they have now 1500 independent congregations in Wales, among 900,000 souls; and nine-tenths of the whole population are now Republicans.

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.—Isa. xxvi, 3.

THE FALL OF MASADA.

The following extract from "the History of the Jews," is what we refered to in our article on the Signs of the Times in the last Examiner. It is of deep interest, for several reasons. First: it shows the intense suffering of that people. Second—it shows that the belief of natural immortality does not keep men from self-destruction. Third—this event took place about three and a half years after the fall of Jerusalem, and marks the termination of the "*one*" prophetic "*week*" of Dan. 9th: which, we believe, commenced when Jerusalem was "compassed about with armies," A. D. 67, and terminated with the fall of Masada A. D. 74; the Temple having been destroyed A. D. 70, "in the midst of the week," and its "sacrifices and oblations" being made "*to cease*," by "the people of the prince that" did "come" against the city.

"The Jewish war terminated in a tragedy which displayed the same obstinate courage and self-devotion as marked its commencement. Flavius Silva, who succeeded Bassus, laid siege to the fortress of Masada, the only fortified place that still remained in the hands of the Sicarii. The genius of ancient fortification produced nothing more remarkable than this celebrated citadel. It was built by Jonathan Maccabæus, and afterwards strengthened and improved by Herod the Great. It stood near the western shore of the Dead Sea, on a height so steep and precipitous that the sun never reached the bottom of the surrounding defiles. Its outer wall was a mile round, with thirty-eight towers, each eighty feet high. Immense marble cisterns; granaries like palaces, capable of holding provisions for years; stores of arms and armor blazing in steel and gold, tastefully arranged in buildings of the stateliest Grecian architecture; and defences of the most costly kind, at every commanding point of the interior, displayed the kingly magnificence and martial pride of the most brilliant, daring, and successful monarch of Judea, since Solomon. On the west side of this fortress, Silva raised a bank two hundred cubits high, and on this he built a platform of stone fifty cubits high, which was surrounded by a moveable tower sixty cubits in height. The place was strong by nature, and was defended with obstinate bravery. At length, the Romans having with great difficulty made a breach in the wall, the besieged Jews betook themselves to the last resort of despair.

"Eleazar, the commander of the fortress, assembled his followers in the palace, and reminded them that the time was now come when they must vindicate the lofty principles of patriotism by which they were distinguished. God had evidently abandoned his people, and permitted the heathen to triumph. This was manifest from the fall of Jerusalem, the ruin of the temple, and the failure of their present bold attempt. Still it was better to fall into the hands of God than of the Roman. Their wives were yet unviolated, their children yet free from captivity, the badge of slavery had not yet been fastened upon them; and Eleazar proposed that they should put the women and children to death, then set the city on fire, and offer up themselves a voluntary sacrifice to the cause of their bleeding

and abandoned country. His men gazed on each other in speechless amazement. Some caught at once the enthusiasm of their leader; others thought of their wives and children, and tears were seen stealing down their hardy cheeks. Eleazer saw that they were wavering, and broke out in a higher and more impassioned strain. He spoke of the immortality, the divinity of the soul: of its joyful escape from the imprisonment of mortality; and its eternal repose in Abraham's bosom. He appealed to their Jewish feelings, to the heroic deeds of their forefathers; and reminded them of the magnanimity of the Indians, who regard life as a restraint, as a burden which they cheerfully throw off when it is required of them. Perhaps with still greater effect he dwelt on the licentiousness and cruelty of the Romans, on their treatment of the vanquished, the abuse of women, the captivity of children, and the murderous scenes in the amphitheatre. "Let us die," he exclaimed, "let us die unenslaved; let us depart from life in freedom with our wives and offspring. This our law enjoins, our country demands, our wives and children entreat. God himself has driven us to this stern necessity; this, the Romans dread above all things, lest we should disappoint them of their expected triumph. Let us deny them the gratification of seeing us enslaved; and rather strike them with awe at our death, and with enforced admiration of our indomitable valor." He was interrupted by the unanimous acquiescence of the multitude, who declared themselves ready to begin on the instant the work of self-devotion. If the softer feelings of humanity for a moment agitated their breast, they had no longer power to control. They embraced their wives, kissed their children, wept over them tears of parental agony, and then, in the frenzy of desperation, stabbed them to the heart. Not a man shrunk from the murderous office; though all seemed to think they should wrong the dead if they survived them many minutes. They hastily collected all their treasures into a heap, and burnt them to ashes. Then ten of the strongest men were selected as the common executioners; the rest, one after another, still clasping the lifeless bodies of their wives and children, held up their necks to the fatal blow. One of the ten was then chosen by lot to destroy the remaining nine; who, having accomplished his task, seized a lighted brand, set fire to the royal palace, and then, with resolute and unflinching hand, drove the sword to his own heart. The Romans entered the city early in the morning, and found it silent as the grave, on which they raised a shout of victory. After a time, two women and five children, who had concealed themselves in an aqueduct, made their appearance, and related to the victors the horrible transaction of the past night. The Romans, having partially extinguished the fire, made their way into the palace, and there beheld, not without admiration, this affecting spectacle of self-devotion."

"Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Such was the forerunner's proclamation; and repentance is the necessary dispensation to all who enter the Kingdom of Christ. It is what I have desired to be acquainted fully with, that I may be qualified to perform acceptable worship. Thus, whatever shall interfere with the sacred unity of the brotherhood, and obstruct the influence of divine charity—all detraction and backbiting, must pass through the fire before we can experience fully the divine regard and blessing, upon our religious assemblings. I would give the right hand of fellowship to any Christian brother who can tell me that he is opposed to detraction.—G. *Dillwyn.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—1 *John* 5: 12.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—This number completes our labor for 1849, and we suppose will end our intercourse with some of our readers; though we indulge the hope that the number may be few. Whether we have profited them by the efforts of the past is known to our Father in heaven and to themselves. If it shall appear, in the day of trial, that we have labored in vain, in relation to any one of our readers, none can regret such a result more than ourself. So far as we know ourself, our most anxious desire has been to honor God and do good to our fellow men by our labors; and we have sought the Divine blessing in prayer on our efforts, that they might result in good to those with whom we have communicated. We have labored amidst trials and conflicts, some of which have been severe indeed. One great point we have kept before our mind the past year, we think, more than ever, viz.—That "though" we could "speak with the tongues of men and angels and have not *love*," we would be "as sounding brass, or a tinkling symbol. And though" we "had the gift of prophecy, and understood all mysteries, and all knowledge; and had all faith so that" we "could remove mountains, and have not *love*," we "are nothing."

Under the influence of this truth we have striven to labor in the Examiner the year now closing. How far we have *manifested* this spirit, in what we have written, our readers will judge; we think, however, that our Father in heaven has, by His grace and Spirit, enabled us to make some improvement, and to Him would we ascribe all the glory. Never have we felt more our dependance upon God for all good—and never have we felt more like cleaving to Him and Him alone, through His Son, for help to do and suffer all His will, that we might *daily* stand approved of Him, and ready to meet "His Son from heaven."

Of our readers, who are unable or indisposed to patronize our paper longer, we take our leave, with the earnest prayer that the rich blessing of God may rest upon them; and we hope that we may all be so unspeakably happy, as to meet in the kingdom of God, at the coming of His Son, and share Eternal Life together. To those who see fit to patronize our labor still, we say—It is our intention to promulgate

truth according to our best understanding; but especially to endeavor to impress all minds, within our influence, that nothing will answer in room of *personal holiness;* or, being *Christ-like.* He is our *pattern—our example.* Whatever else we have, if we *have not* his spirit—his temper of mind—his meekness—his patience—his forgiving spirit—his forbearance—his love—his devotion to his Father's will, we are not what we should be, nor what we may be through that strength which we may receive by union with the Lord; for, "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit;" and can, therefore, "do all things," as he has omnipotence to strengthen him.

THE TERMS of the Examiner for 1850 will be *one dollar.* For *five* dollars six copies will be sent; and for $10 thirteen. In all cases we must adhere to our terms of *payment in advance.* If any, therefore, do not receive the January number, they will understand the reason. Agents should not fail to remit money in their hands before the end of this month. We invite our friends to act at once, if they wish to encourage us in our work, and see with how many subscribers we are to commence our next volume. Can we not have a response from you immediately?

Subscribers in Boston can pay Br. Geo. T. Adams, 87 Hanover St., or remit to us, as they prefer.

All communications and remittances designed for the Examiner, should be addressed "GEO. STORRS, Philadelphia, Pa."

BOUND VOLUMES of the Examiner for '48 and '49, *in one* volume, will be ready in a few days. *Price* $1.25 for one copy, or *five* copies for $5.00. Those who wish to furnish themselves with a copy should lose no time in ordering it, as we can supply only a limited number for both years.

THE "FIVE BRETHREN."—Br. I. E. Jones, Brooklyn, N. Y., in an article published in the Advent Harbinger, Nov. 10th, in speaking of the Rich man and Lazarus, to prove man is a "*complex being,*" and that he is conscious when dead, says: "This was either a literal case, or it was a parable. If the former, it proves my position; if the latter, it is worse than meaningless. For," says he, "if it represented the Jew and Gentile, who were represented by the five brethren? for there is no *third* class," and so, he adds, "FIVE men represent NOBODY!!"

We do not wonder that Br. Jones made *two* marks of surprise after such a paragraph; for we think almost any one would be amazed to hear an intelligent man make a statement so at variance with facts. Besides the "Jew and Gentile," says Br. Jones, "there is no *third* class." The Jews constitute only *one-sixth* of the posterity of Jacob; for the *ten tribes* are never called Jews in the Bible; that appellation is invariably applied to Judah and Benjamin, and to none of the *kingdom of Israel.* The term Jew comes from Judah, and signifies "the praise of the Lord." Judah was he whom his "*brethren*" should "praise." Now, then, we affirm that when our Lord spoke the parable in question there was a "*third* class," viz. The ten tribes, who constituted "FIVE" sixths of the posterity of Jacob.

Now follows a statement from Br. Jones in regard to us, which is *news.* Perhaps he learned it by *clairvoyance;* but if so, we assure him his clairvoyant was a "blind leader of the blind," for the following sentiment, which he attributes to us, we never uttered, and it never entered our *mind*—we NEVER THOUGHT OF IT till we saw it in Br. Jones article. He says—"Br. Storrs thinks that he has found their [the five brethren's] representation in the heathen between the resurrections, who will receive the gospel by persons sent unto them from the dead—that is, the resurrection saints."

We repeat it—the sentiment here attributed to us never entered our mind, and, of course, we never did nor could utter it. But the statement is valuable, as showing how little attention our opponents give to what we do say, and of how little value are their attempted refutations of our positions.

Br. Jones makes one of the most bold assertions on this parable that we have lately met with; and had it come from our side of the question, we might, not unjustly, perhaps, been charged with claiming *infallibility,* or as staking the truth of the Bible on the truth of *our* construction of it. He says—"This Scripture gives us the fullest proof of the conscious, intermediate existence of the dead—or, IT IS WORSE THAN MEANINGLESS"!!!!!!

The Lord preserve us from ever saying, our construction of any text is true, or that text is without meaning; and may Br. Jones see his error and retract it; we trust he will do it, and be more guarded for time to come.

MR. HINTON'S "ATHANASIA."—NO. IV.

We come now to that part of Mr. Hinton's work which he has specially devoted to our "Six Sermons." The first thing we note is a misapprehension of our meaning in stating the question at issue. We say, p. 4, "The question is not, whether the soul *can* be immortal," &c. Mr. H., quoting these words, says—"By which he evidently means that it can live for ever. Now," adds Mr. H., "it is but saying the same thing in other words, to affirm that the soul has an adaptation to endless existence, since it is only by virtue of such adaptation that it can live for ever," p. 339. We only intended to admit that God *could* superadd endless existence if he chose to bestow it as a *gift.* That which has no "adaptation to endless existence" can have conferred upon it as a *gift* of God both the adaptation and the endless existence

by a "change." If Mr. H. deny this he must deny the endless existence of the resurrection body as well as of those who are alive and "changed in a moment at the last trump."

On our question, Six Sermons, p. 7, "Is it the will of God that wicked men shall be immortal?" Mr. H. says, "That it raises an inquiry remote from the true point before us; an inquiry, namely, respecting positive endless existence, which is erroneously identified with natural immortality." He adds, "Mr. Storrs has adopted that definition of immortality which has vitiated so many of the reasonings framed by other writers on this subject, and it will be found to vitiate his own:" p. 340.

We have only to say, that we have never found nor heard of an advocate of man's immortality in this country but what has maintained that "*positive endless existence*" was the exact idea of immortality; and we shall be glad to find them, in this respect, adopting Mr. Hinton's view, for then the dispute between us will be much narrowed. Mr. H. admits that "God's will" is the "source of man's immortality." On that point we are agreed; but he refers "the *will* of God" to a determination "that man should be endowed with an adaptation to live for ever." We might admit that without at all affecting the real question at issue; for what we maintain is, That whatever "adaptation" man has, it is the will of God that he shall not have endless existence, unless he has also holiness, or attains to a moral character that is in consonance with the character of God.

Mr. H. comments on the expression in our Sermons, p. 7, "In the day man sinned he lost all title to immortality," and says, "In order to lose a title to immortality, Adam must have antecedently possessed one:" and he adds, "Our author has laid it down that this was the very thing for which man was a probationer, and the acquisition of which was to reward his obedience. Consequently, such title, having never been acquired, it could not be lost:" p. 346. *Critically* Mr. Hinton is correct, but according to *common parlance*, or custom in talking, *we* are also correct. We often speak of a man's losing what he might have secured: and it is not unlikely that Mr. H has told sinners that by persisting in sin they would lose all title to heaven; if he has not, others have, and were not misunderstood, though such language is not critically correct. We will therefore stand corrected by Mr. H., in the *form* of the expression, and it may hereafter read—"*By sin man failed to secure* a title to immortality;" and Mr. H. could hardly have failed to see that that was the sense in which we used the previous expression, as we said a few sentences further on, "Adam *came short* of immortality."

On our expression—"God determined, or willed, that *man* should not be immortal in his sin," Six Ser., p. 7, Mr. Hinton says—"That God had determined that Adam should 'not be immortal in his sin,' in the sense of corporeal existence, is doubtless true; not, as learned peculiarly from the words used on his expulsion from Eden, but rather from the previous and direct annexation of death to the violation of the precept enjoined." Happy as we should be to accommodate our brother Hinton we cannot admit his position. Do we not learn "peculiarly" from the words "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," what *kind* of a death "God willed" man should die, and not "alone from the previous and direct annexation of death to the violation of the precept enjoined?" And is it not equally evident that the language used on man's expulsion from Eden teaches us "peculiarly" God's determination that man should not have endless existence? "Lest he take and eat thereof and *live forever*" he is sent forth from Eden, and the "*tree of life*" is guarded to prevent his access to it. Not barely to cut off his "corporeal existence," as Mr. H. *assumes*, for no such distinction is made in the transaction. "The Lord God said—THE MAN is become as one of us—now lest he [*the man*] put forth his hand—eat and LIVE FOREVER," &c. It was "*the man*" that should not live for ever—it was "the man" whose "existence" was cut short, not his "*corporeal* existence" merely: no, Mr. H. has *added* to the word of truth here to make it correspond with a favorite idea of his, elsewhere expressed, that "Death is a change in the mode of human existence, effected by the cessation of the organic functions, but one not interrupting the conscious being of the individual:" p. 136. Such an exposition of death we do not admit; for that would not be the death of "the man"—the very thing his Maker threatened—and which he secured by preventing his access to the tree of life. No, Mr. Hinton's definition of death does not agree either with the threatening nor with the language of Jehovah in formally pronouncing the sentence after the offence committed, nor with the means employed to bring about the execution; nor, indeed, with the execution itself; for "MAN DIETH" is the voice of the Bible; not, man's "corporeal existence" ends, but his "conscious being" is "not interrupted:" no, it is the man himself. Mr. Hinton had just before said that "death" was "the natural destiny of the body:" p. 344. If it was its "*natural* destiny," then why may not the "annexation of death to the violation of the precept enjoined" have related to something more or beside the body? But it is due to Mr. H. to say, that he supposes "the natural destiny of the body" might "possibly" have been "avoided if disobedience had been avoided." After such positions by him, shall we be considered unsound in faith if we affirm that "the natural destiny of *the*" *man*, THE ENTIRE MAN, was to "death?" and that, therefore, he was a "probationer for immortality?" the very point in our Six Sermons which Mr. H. attempts to disprove. According to his own admission man was "possibly" a probationer for immortality for his *body*; and if for a *part* of him, why not for *the whole*? Our readers, however, will probably be surprised that Mr. H. should make a statement like the following:—"What I affirm is that man is naturally *incorruptible*, and thus adapted to endlesss being:" p. 461. The two statements, *viz.*, "Death the natural destiny of the body," p. 344, and "man is naturally *incorruptible*," p. 461, appear quite as irreconcileable as any thing he has collected in his "chapter of contradictions;" and much more so, from the consideration that his chapter of contradictions does not exhibit the writers he notices as contradicting themselves, but only as lacking in perfect agreement on all points, one with the other; while Mr. H. does really *seem* to disagree with himself. We are bound, however, to put the most charitable construction upon his language we can, and that is

this—that Mr. H., at least, half inclines to Swedenborgianism, *i. e.*, that there is no resurrection of the body at all. And we are the more led to this conclusion because, in his inquiry "Who will live forever?" he states that "our translators uniformly, but sometimes unhappily, render [*anastasis*] resurrection;" and contends that it signifies "*future life*," and says, p. 427, in his answer to the above inquiry, "I shall now use the freedom of habitually employing the phrase *future life* instead of *resurrection*." If he does agree with Swedenborg, on that point, he is then consistent with the scheme of immortal-soulism; for, no other system is consistent which maintains that scheme.

What Mr. H. says, from p. 346 to 348, on our language—"That this loss relates to the whole man," &c., arises from a misapprehension of our meaning; for which, however, he is not wholly in fault, as our Six Sermons, reprinted in England, contain an expression which we struck out of the revised edition, 18mo., in this country, near five years since; though we see it still remains in our quarto edition which was stereotyped in 1843. We had said that in "the language" of exclusion from the tree of life the Lord God expressed his determination that man should not be immortal in his sin; and we added:—

"That this loss relates to the whole man, and not to the body merely, as some suppose, I prove from the fact, that the destiny of the body had already been announced. Besides, if it related to the body only, then there is not a particle of evidence in the transaction, of pronouncing sentence upon man, by his Maker, that any penalty was threatened to the soul, or inflicted upon it."

Mr. H. quotes the first sentence in this paragraph, leaving out the words "*as some suppose*," and says—"He [Mr. Storrs] here refers, no doubt, to that part of Adam's sentence, 'For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return' which had been pronounced before God declared his intention of expelling him from Eden, lest he should live for ever:" and Mr. H. adds—"The author thinks the former words contemplated the body only, and that consequently the latter must have contemplated that of the soul." In reply we say, "the author" *thought* no such thing: "the author" struck out the words, five years ago, from the revised 18mo. edition, "*the destiny of the body had already been announced*;" so that it now reads—"That the loss relates to the whole man, and not to the body merely, *as some suppose*, I prove from the fact, that if it related to the body *only*, there is not a particle of evidence in the transaction, of pronouncing sentence upon man, by his Maker, that any penalty was threatened to the soul, or inflicted upon it." Here then is no expression of a thought, on our part, that in the words "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," that "the destiny of the body *only*" was "contemplated." We believe with Mr. H. that it related to "the death of the man;" but we do not believe with him that it was "*not*" to effect "the cessation of the conscious being of the soul." What Mr. H. says, therefore, about our refusing to "allow even the direct menace, 'Thou shalt surely die,' to relate to any thing but the body" is all from a misapprehension of what we said: we do believe it related to the *whole man*; but if the notion of Mr. H., and others, that death is only "the cessation of the organic functions," meaning those of the body, while the soul, which according to them is a distinct entity, or existence, be true, then "the man" was not threatened with death, and the *essential* sinner escaped unharmed—death could not touch that entity which they call the soul, and which constitutes the man proper; for Mr. Lee, of the True Wesleyan, says—"The body is never conscious—consciousness is purely an operation of the mind;" and Mr. Hinton says, "Death is the cessation of the organic functions;" which, according to Mr. Lee, never had any "consciousness," and "the cessation" of them, says, Mr. H., does not produce "the cessation" of the "conscious being of the soul;" so that between them "the man" escapes death; or to use Mr. Hinton's own phraseology, "Death is a change in the mode of man's existence—but one not interrupting the conscious being of the individual." The original threatening then resolves itself into this, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely have thy *mode* of existence changed."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—NO. V.

REMARKS ON LUKE 21: 20 to 36—CONTINUED.

In our previous number we brought our observations down to the close of verse 26. In proceeding we wish to call attention to a fact which we think has been generally overlooked, *viz.*, That our Lord states distinctly *two* classes of events and two classes of signs that shall indicate the different events presented. The first events are Jerusalem's *desolation* and *subjection* to the Gentiles. The second are, Jerusalem's emancipation and the establishment of "the kingdom of God."

The *sign* of the first class of events is thus stated, verse 20, "When ye *see* Jerusalem *compassed about with armies, then* KNOW that the *desolation* thereof is *nigh*." The *signs* of the second class of events are in the 25th and 26th verses; and our Lord adds, verse 31, "When ye *see* these things come to pass, KNOW ye that the *kingdom of God* is *nigh* at hand." Here are two very different events; *viz.* *First*, Jerusalem's desolation, with days of vengeance, and subjugation to the Gentiles: *Second*, Jerusalem's emancipation, the redemption of the followers of Christ, and the establishment of the kingdom of God: and each class of events has appropriate signs for the guide of sincere inquirers after truth. Let these things be kept in mind and we may be saved from that confusion which is so often introduced into the exposition of this prophecy.

The exposition, verse 24—"*Until* the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," cannot be made to mean that the treading under foot was never to cease, but the reverse, *viz.*—That a time would come when that desolation should terminate, and Jerusalem be no longer trodden under foot. To say otherwise is to contradict some of the plainest prophecies of the Bible. For example:

JER. 31: 38—40.—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the city shall be built to the Lord from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner. And the measuring line shall yet go forth over against it upon the hill of Gareb, and shall compass about to Goath. And the whole valley of the dead bodies, and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the brook of Kidron, unto the corner of the horse gate toward the east, shall be holy unto the Lord; it shall not be plucked up, nor thrown down any more forever."

It cannot be pretended that this prophecy has had its fulfilment since the Babylonish captivity: for "the city" then rebuilt has been both "*plucked up*" and "*thrown down;* and our Lord said it would be. This prophecy, then, of Jeremiah, is future, and will be accomplished in the deliverance of Jerusalem from the Gentiles, and the rebuilding of the city.

If our remarks in our previous number are well founded, we are now living in the time of a series of convulsions that will not terminate before the great and glorious event takes place spoken of in following words—"And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory."

"Then"—*when?* While these convulsions are going on; or, immediately after; for so the word signifies. "Shall *they* see;" "they," *who?* Is it not the same "*they,*" or people, spoken of in verse 24, who were to be led away captive into all nations? and who, with their city, were to be subjected to the Gentile governments until their times were fulfilled, or accomplished? "Till that time our Lord had said of "Jerusalem" and her "children," [see Mat. 23: 37–39] "ye shall not see me," &c.; evidently implying that the time would come when he would manifest himself once more to that people at the termination of the times of the Gentiles, being at the time of or in connection with his second advent. We do not affirm that this is the true interpretation of this verse; but think when viewed with the 24th and many other prophecies, that we are probably not far from correct in our view of it.

The next verse is an address to his followers living at the period when these signs shall appear. "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for *your* redemption draweth nigh." From the commencement of the signs the living saints were to be encouraged and comforted with the expectation of a speedy deliverance; and were to look up for the return of their long absent Lord. Though we would not pretend to decide positively as to the order of events still future, yet we incline to the opinion that the gathering of the saints, or those who are to constitute the "kings and priests" of the coming age, will take place prior to the manifestations spoken of in verse 27; and that while the convulsions among the nations are in progress; thus escaping some of the heaviest calamities that are coming on them that dwell on the earth near the time of the establishment of the kingdom of God: but our reasons for this view must be reserved for another time.

VERSES 29—31.—"And he spake to them a parable; Behold the fig tree, and all the trees; when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand"

This illustration is exceedingly forcible. It shows that the near approach of the kingdom of God—of the dominion and reign of Christ—can be as surely known as the approach of summer by the budding trees. Hence christian men are inexcusable if they remain in ignorance of a matter of such startling interest and importance.

We suggest whether our Lord in his reference to the fig tree, may not have had the nation of Judah, or the Jews, especially in mind. In Luke 13: 6, he compares that nation to an unfruitful "fig tree." In Mat. 21: 19 our Lord cursed a barren fig tree, and said, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever"—*aiona*—for the age. This transaction has been by many considered emblematical of the curse that afterwards fell upon the Jewish nation, to be continued to the close of the then coming age; or gospel age. That curse fell at the compassing about of Jerusalem with armies, and has remained till the present time. But just as the times of the Gentiles gave evidence of closing, we see the iron oppression which has trodden down the Jews, giving way, and the Jews every where rising up to a position among nations which indicates returning life to them as a people. The present century has witnessed privileges and advantages, civil and ecclesiastical, to them, to which they have been strangers for eighteen centuries previous. The United States were the first to set the example of abolishing all those distinctions which had so long oppressed and crushed the sons of Jacob. Since then other nations have changed their policy towards them, till those oppressive acts under which they groaned are every where giving way to a policy which opens to them equally with other men posts of honor and profit. It were easy to enlarge here; but to those who have access to the general news of the times in which we live, it is unnecessary at this time. That the Jews give signs of returning life, as a fig tree putting forth leaves, none can doubt, except they are inexcusably in the dark. If these things are so, then we have another unmistakeable sign that summer approaches; or, "that the kingdom of God," the fifth universal monarchy upon earth, "is nigh at hand." Yes, That the Lord God is about to give Jesus Christ "the throne of his father David," as he promised by the mouth of Gabriel, Luke 1: 31–33, and in many other prophecies. How eventful—how solemnly interesting is the time in which we live! How does it become us all to keep awake to the word of the Lord, and the events of his providence, in a day like this!

"Verily I say unto you this generation [who are witnesses of the foregoing signs,] shall not pass away until all be fulfilled,"—take place, come to pass, or occur. The last thing in the prophetic chain is the establishment of the kingdom of God. If then our interpretation be the true one, many now living will see the establishment of Jesus Christ, in his glory, on David's throne, with his dominion over all the earth, or "under the whole heaven." The decree has gone forth, and it is unalterable: kings and great men of earth, whether republicans or monarchists, will rage against this universal and personal reign of Christ with his "joint heirs," the saints of the Most High, but their rage will be vain; for he will break them in pieces, who oppose, as a potter's vessel is broken. Let them haste then to do him homage, and submit themselves to him, "lest they perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Psa. 2: 1–3, 10–12. We are now brought down to the admonitions and cautions connected with this important prophecy: these are found in the following language.

VERSES 34—36.—"And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come

on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things which shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man."

Every word here is emphatic, and of solemn importance. "Take *heed*," *mind*, *observe:* give attention—"*to yourselves*:" remember it is a *personal* matter, and every one should now look well to himself—"*lest*" for fear that "*at any time*"—as you know not the exact time—"your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness"—excessive eating and drinking; or, be overloaded by food or drink; either of which unfits us for sober thinking, and that circumspection of life which the solemn scenes before us, and at hand, demand. "And *cares of this life:* however important these cares may be, we are to beware lest we are *overloaded* by them; "and so that day come upon us unawares"—unexpectedly, or without due preparation to meet it; "for as a *snare* [or net] shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth." It will "come in an hour when" even the saints "*think not.*" But though they too are taken in the snare, or net, they shall be safely gathered, according to the parable of our Lord, in which he compares the kingdom of heaven to a net cast into the sea, which, when it was full, they draw to shore and gather the *good* into vessels, but cast the *bad* away. To share the part of the good, our Saviour further enjoins upon us to "*watch and pray always.*" Always to be vigilant, wakeful to the solemn events before us, and in prayer to God for that aid without which we shall fail for "lack of wisdom" and strength to overcome the innumerable besetments by which the things of this life entice us away from God and his service. But if we heed the warning, caution, and admonition here given us we have the gracious assurance that we shall be accounted worthy to escape harm and to stand before the Son of Man; which language imports his acceptance and approval at his coming; a reward, truly, sufficient, if duly considered, to lead us to constant effort, and obedience.

LETTERS.

A PLAIN TALK.

Brother Storrs:—I am aware that much of the wisdom of this age is engaged in discussing the philosophy of man and the erroneous notion of the inherent immortality of the soul, &c. Still, I believe a little more might be profitably said that would enlighten and strengthen the weak minds of some who are just beginning to look at the subject, having of late been engaged at different times in a friendly discussion of the above doctrines with a dear Brother, to whom I have loaned my papers, who now begins to see men as trees walking, though formerly he was as blind as Bartimeas. For the good of such, I wish to lay before them a few of the ideas which I so effectually used in the above brother's case. In vain may philosophers weary themselves to find out the import of God's word by their philosophy—in vain may we pore over their writings to find out true knowledge—and in vain may the religionist search for truth, if he could circumnavigate the entire world and read every printed page, so long as his mind is blinded by the fogs of mysticism which is thrown around the Bible by spiritualizers. But when he takes the plain, simple, literal meaning of the Bible, then the darkness flees away like the morning fog before the rising sun. But to the subject. Br. M. says, if the soul or spirit of man is not a distinct something from the body that leaves the body at death, and like an angel, soars away to heaven or hell, and forever remains conscious or happy, or miserable, as the soul or person was righteous or sinful before death, then what is the soul? and where is it? and how does it exist in man? I replied, I will tell you what I can about it. God formed man at the first out of the ground, (the very identical material of which he formed all the animals) and, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and (the perfect man in all his parts, though lifeless and dead) became a living (active) soul, (or man.) Gen. 2: 7, 19. But God created each creature, from the smallest insect up to the great Leviathan of the deep, which maketh the sea to boil like a pot, with a different form, inclinations, and distinctive organization, most suitable to act in the sphere in which he designed each should act. And it pleased him to give man a superior form and organization above the beasts of the field. In this particular God made man a rational, intelligent, self-governable being, and endowed him with a superior measure of sensibility and affections. The head or brain is the seat of intellect, or sensibility. And the heart is the seat of all the affections. Hence we say, when these two prime organs, namely, the head and heart, are put in motion, (by air being infused into the lungs) thus combined and acting in harmony together constitute the living soul. And the spirit of a man is simply that good or evil inclination which directs the will or choice; the immediate result of a combination of the sensibility of the head and inclinations and feelings of the heart. Hence the soul can only live just as long as the air or breath of life is infused into the lungs; because all is put in operation and kept in motion alone by the breath. Hence, when a man dies God simply takes away the breath which he gave at birth, and will again restore in or at the resurrection. This view of the subject then enables us with certainty, to say, that death is nothing less or more than a disorganization. The breath which God had given for the sole and only purpose of acting with and giving energy to the thinking head and feeling heart, which is the sum total of the soul, in death he takes away. Hence in the article of death most certainly the soul is dead as well as the body, inasmuch as it has lost or been deprived of that active agent, the breath, which alone put body and soul in motion. Agreeably to this view of the subject, the Psalmist, in his 146th psalm, 4th verse, says, "In death his (man's) breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth in that very day his thoughts perish."* The dust now returns to the earth as it was, and that animating principle called the breath, God has taken to himself again. In this case, then, the soul must certainly be dead, inasmuch as it has lost all its thinking powers, &c., while the body sleepeth. Solomon says, "The

*Inasmuch as the "thoughts" of the dead are "perished" in death, it follows surely that that which originated them, viz., the head or brain, and heart, (when active, constitutes essentially the soul of man in life) is dead also. The thoughts being dead, fully demonstrates that the soul, which originated them, is dead also. What can be plainer?

dead know not anything," &c., Eccl. 9: 5. And David says, "In death there is no remembrance of God," Ps. 6: 5; and that "the dead praise not the Lord, nor any that go down into silence;" Ps. 115: 17. Hence we believe that all the dead, soul and body both, are literally, and in the full sense of the word, dead; and but for the resurrection of the dead, would forever and eternally remain dead, just like the brute creation. In proof see Eccl. 3: 18, 19, 20; Ps. 49: 12, 15.

In view of all this plain but overwhelming testimony, which will you now believe—the popular theory, that makes all the dead much more alive in death than they were in this life? or the word of God? which so plainly teaches that in death man holds no preeminence above the beasts of the field, until God reorganize him again in the resurrection—remodeling his body anew, and then infuses into his lungs the breath of life again, which puts again in motion the thinking head and feeling heart, makes man once more a living (being) or soul.

But I must close with the admonition of the wise man; "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest," Eccl. 9: 10. All is silence, and the light is as darkness itself. But the sweet singer of Israel exultingly exclaims, "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave," &c. Ps. 49: 15. Now let me ask, how David's soul could be redeemed from the power of the grave, unless it was actually dead and in the grave, and under the power of death? S. L. Robinson.

Wales Hallow, 1849.

P. S. I read your paper with constantly increasing interest and delight. I should feel a great loss without it. Your Six Sermons and Bible Examiner, have been the means, under God, of thoroughly converting me from many essential errors in doctrine. I have lent my papers to all that I could induce to read them. But there is an awful blindness resting like the pall of death over the minds of all. Yes, all the rejectors of the doctrine of the speedy advent of Christ. Alas, what will they do in the day of visitation, when destruction and desolation cometh from afar? To whom will they flee for help? And where will they leave their glory? My heart is pained for them, and my soul crieth out in the language of the lamenting Prophet—"O, that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of thy people. Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? But I must close. My heart is full, and struggling to get vent. My prayer to God is, that your paper may be far better sustained in future. Be encouraged, Brother, God will never leave you, unless you first leave him. Go on; the haven of eternal rest is but just before you. Let us there be found at last, is the sincere desire of your unworthy Brother in deep afflictions, though in hope of immortality at the appearing of the King of kings. S. L. R.

THE GLORIOUS PERSONAGE.

Jesus Christ the Lord.

That Jesus Christ was here once in the flesh, so that the human family beheld him, and conversed with him, no man pretends to deny that believes the Bible to be the word of God. But touching his second coming, how various are their opinions. Some say, he comes at death; others say, he came in a Roman army at the destruction of Jerusalem; and some at one period of time, and some at another. If they can believe the testimony of the first, why not of the second coming? The Bible is just as plain in one case as the other.

In the first, only a part of the world saw him; but, in the second coming, or connected with it, all eyes are to behold him. The Bible tells us of his humble form: it also tells us of his glorious form. In both cases, he is described as being in *shape* a man. How vain it is, then, to try to make it appear, that his second coming is not visible and future. He was seen to go away. The Angels said, He should come again in like manner, (visible.) Christ says, If I go away, I will come again. Paul says, He appeared once, and, unto them that look for him, he would appear the second time, to save them. Those three passages of Scripture are to the point. We have Christ's testimony, the Angels' testimony, and Paul's testimony. If our father was to set out, in our presence, for a foreign land, to prepare us a good comfortable home, and should tell us, If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again to take you there, that where I am there ye may be also: would we believe the truth was told us, if, instead of coming himself, he would send a Roman army to slay and destroy us? All must say, no! Would we believe his two confidential friends told us the truth, if he came in any other way than personally?

Why, then, maintain that Jesus Christ is not still in (the far country) heaven? and is not to come again personally, the second time, to save us? He has power sufficient to come personally and visibly. Then he will tell the truth himself, and his witnesses will tell no lies. Christ warns us to beware of false Christs, and false prophets, between his going away and coming again, but does not caution us to beware of any after he comes. I presume there will be none so bold as to claim to be his superior at his return. His word tells us of his glorious garments, and brilliant apparel, which is beyond the power of man to imitate. Daniel describes his beautiful appearance; Dan. 10: 5, 6. John the Revelator also beheld him; see Rev. 1: 13 to 18.

When Christ was transfigured on the mount, he must have appeared similar to Daniel and John's description of him. Christ compares his coming to lightning, both in Matthew and Luke. Paul speaks of His coming in flaming fire, taking vengeance, in 2 Thess. 1: and in the 2d chapter speaks of his destroying his foes by the brightness of his coming. John says, the sons of God shall be like him when he appears. Christ says, the righteous, at the end of this world, shall shine like the sun, in the kingdom of their father. Well, has Christ ever come in such a glorious form? He said that he would come with power and great glory. We have no account that any such scene ever took place. The Bible is plain upon this subject, and all those that cannot believe the testimony of the glorious form of Jesus Christ, at his second coming, I think have not much faith concerning his first coming. It is altogether a mistake, then, according to Bible testimony, that Christ's second coming is past. Depend upon it, there has nothing but false Christs appeared yet, between the first and second advent of the true Messiah. The true one is in the rear, and last of all. Christ says, the righteous shall shine

like the sun, in the kingdom of their Father, at the end of this world. But not one word does he say of their shining like the sun at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at death, or in their grave. We must all wait until Christ, who is our life, shall appear in his glorious form, and almighty power,—to give us life and immortality. We are not to say, when death is piercing us with his arrows, and filling us with the most acute pain—"O, death, where is thy sting?" nor in the grave, when it has all power over us—"O, grave, where is thy victory?" But, let those say, that are changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and are snatched from the power and sting of death, at the sounding of the last trump, let those say, "O, death, where is thy sting?" And those that are raised from the dead, out of the grave, and above its power, let them say, "O, grave, where is thy victory?" Where now is thy victory, oh boasting grave? Be consistent, all ye that read your Bibles. Do not take a poor Roman army to be your Saviour: for, death has pierced it with his arrows long ago: the grave has it for his prisoner. But trust in Jesus Christ: for he says, "Behold I am alive for ever more." Do not trust in such a saviour as comes at death to save you. He is no more to be trusted for a savior than the Roman army. At the time you may think he is passing you into endless joy, and everlasting felicity, he will deliver you into a bondage so strong, that you will not enjoy even the privilege of thinking, to say nothing of doing, for, "There is no work, nor device, *nor knowledge*, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest." "The dead know not any thing—they praise not the Lord." Slaves they are indeed. Come out from such slavery: or, rather, trust in the Saviour that the Bible describes unto you; who will bring you out from such abject bondage. Paul says—"But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory, [over death and the grave] through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 15: 57. J. H. DENHAM.

FROM BR. DILLABAUGH.

Victor, N. Y., October 11th, 1849.

BRO. STORRS,—I am not a subscriber to your paper, but I eagerly grasp it, and peruse its pages when it comes within my reach. I esteem it as highly as any advent paper now published. You are, however, but a mortal man, and liable to err as well as others; therefore we do not expect to get all the truth, on all points of scripture, from you alone; but our duty is to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good, (the truth.)

The first I heard on the glorious subject of the coming of our Blessed King, was in the fall of 1846. I saw no other advent paper but the Herald until the summer of 1847; and, until then, I was a stranger to the true source of immortality and the final destiny of the ungodly. I now rejoice that I have been brought to see, by examining the word of God, that there is no immortality out of Christ; and the only way to obtain it is by a faithful continuance in well doing. I have oftimes been told, by those professing faith in the coming of our Lord, that Bro. Storrs is off the track—i. e. the direct path that leads the traveller to the port of Glory. The reasons they give are as follows. You were very positive on time in 1843 and '44, and made a sacrifice of your possessions, and laid all on the altar; and by doing so, it has caused you to look too far in the future for the advent of our blessed Lord! But, I think, if you have but little of this world's goods, and your treasure in heaven, (where I trust it is,) you would be desiring the time to come when you would no longer be heir to the inheritance, but a possessor. I have not so learned of Christ that riches in this world will secure our title to the promised inheritance—and I trust you have not. Faith without works is dead. I think it would be well for some to read Luke 12: 32, 33, and on to the end, and obey as our great Teacher has commanded, and as his disciples did in the days of the apostles: see Acts 2d and 4th chapters. Again, they say you have entertained strange notions, which they call error; that is, probation after the advent of Christ. Well, I can't see as you do on that point; still, I have no desire to say it is error until I can prove it from the word of God. I do think there is a greater work to be done after Christ comes than many think; and I believe that in a very few months more he will come in his own glory, and of his Father's, and the Holy Angels.

Now I want to give you a few passages of scripture, and I desire you to give me all the light you have on the same, and answer me through the Harbinger, as there may be others benefitted as well as myself, who do not take the Examiner. See Zech. 2: 4, and 1: 17; also 2: 10 to 13. Ezek. 36: 10, 33, 35. Isa. 60: 10—18; 61: 4. Jer. 31: 38. Isa. 54: 11—15. Ezek. 38: 11—; 39: 9; and 48: 35. Amos 9: 14. Zech. 6: 12 to end. If this scripture has had a fulfilment, show me when, and if a conditional promise, where is the condition? and if it yet remains to be fulfilled, will it not be after Christ comes? and before the New Jerusalem City comes down on the New Earth? Please give an answer.

Yours, in hope of soon seeing Jesus and being made like him,

GEORGE DILLABAUGH.

An exposition of the texts you have presented, and multitudes more that might be added, could not make the subject plainer. "If they hear not the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." As to all the evil that is said of us, we leave that for the Lord to adjust; praying that, so far as any sin against us, He may not lay it to their charge. We trust they know not what they do.—ED. EXAMINER.

FROM BR. T. GRANDY.

Vergennes, Vt., Nov. 10th, 1849.

BR. STORRS,—If it were within my means to render you aid in publishing the Bible Examiner, I would gladly do so; for, I believe it is an efficient agent, wherever it is *examined*, in rending the veil of man's traditions from many minds, so that the light of that glorious gospel may shine which brings "*life* and *immortality* to light."

I was always a believer in the doctrine of a literal resurrection, but was unable to discover much of the importance the scriptures seemed to attach to it while I received "for doctrine" the "tradition," that, at death, the righteous go to heaven, where, in the "presence of God, there is

fulness of joy." But when, in the light of God's truth, directly spoken, I could see that "The dead know not anything,"—that death is not a compound, composed of half death and half life—that mortality is not *mixed with*, but is to "*put on* immortality,"—then, and not until then, I could say of the doctrine of the resurrection, it were "a consummation devoutly to be wished." The "wisdom of men," which God calls "foolishness," has half manufactured the plan, or rather, manufactured *half* the plan, by saving enough of the man to form a kind of nucleus, around which it may be possible for God to gather the rest—the "scattered fragments"—the "sleeping dust"—and so produce a resurrection; which, indeed, would be but half a resurrection when produced. Do they not err? "not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God."

Yours, hoping for immortality at the resurrection, TRUMAN GRANDY.

NEW YORK.—Our subscribers in that city and vicinity will have an opportunity to pay us for the Examiner for 1850, *personally*; as we design spending a few days there the first week this month. They may expect to see us Monday and Tuesday, and perhaps Wednesday, the 3d, 4th, and 5th inst. If we have no meetings in the evenings of those days, they may find us by inquiry at Henry F. Johnson's, 327 Hudson Street, or at Dr. Doolittle's, 133 Grand Street. If we preach in the evenings, they may expect to learn the *place* by the Sun and Tribune.

PLEDGES for Examiner for 1850, since our last:

A. B. Magruder, Charlotteville, Va., $3 00

DONATIONS since our last to complete this volume.

Martin Funk, Middletown, Pa., - - $2 00

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in

BOSTON, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 87 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store.

ALBANY, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, and H. B Holmes, 16 S. Pearl St.

NEW YORK CITY, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., of Ransom Hicks, No 215 Pine St.

HARTFORD, Conn., of Dr. D. Crary, and Eld. J. S White.

Our "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh, Geo. T. Adams, Dr. Burdell, Dr. Crary, Eld. White, and Ransom Hicks.

PRICE OF BOOKS, ETC., AT THE EXAMINER OFFICE.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, (New Hymn Book, 128 pages, 24mo., paper covers, 15 cts. each; ten copies for $1 00; for $8.00, one hundred copies.

SIX SERMONS, Quarto, 16 pages, (newspaper postage, only, when sent by mail,) $1.00 per forty copies. No further discount can be made on either of the above works.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, bound, *seventy five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifty*.

SIX SERMONS, 18mo., 120 pages, bound, *twenty five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifteen*.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, bound in plain morocco, *twenty-five* cts.

On the three last named works *one-third* discount will be made to those who buy to sell again: and we will make a still further discount of *twenty per cent.* to those who send us twenty dollars, current money, at one time. This offer is designed to enable those who may wish it, to keep a depository of these works, and to cover their expense for transportation. The names of such we will place in the list of depositories, in the Examiner.

☞We cannot make the "twenty per cent" discount unless our terms are strictly complied with; as we are subjected to an additional charge to our printer if we have credit for his work; and a less sum than $20 would not help us much in obtaining discount with him.

INDEX TO VOL. IV.

Atonement. By H. Grew, - - - - 84
Atonement, Doctrine of, by Chadwick, - - 92
Affectionate Preaching, - - - - - 95
Arrogancy of Sectarianism, - - - - 107
"Athanasia," Hinton's, - - 132, 153, 169, 185

Bishop Whately on Intermediate State, - - 4
Baptism—Magruder and Grew, - - - 164
Bearing the Cross, - - - - - - - 135

Did it rain before the Flood? - - - - 33
Dr. Lee and the Baptists of the South, 61, 107, 149
Discussion by Brewster and Walsh, - 1, 17, 49, 65
Discussion in Great Britain—Letter of Dr. Lees, 39
Definite Time of the Advent, - - - - 137
Does it do any Good?—Letters of Chaplin & Hall, 71
Definition of Words. By Dr. Lee, N. C., - 179

Exposition of Scripture, 29, 42, 67, 91, 108, 125, 180
Events, Future. By H. E. Carver, - - - 127
Editorial Generosity—True Wesleyan, - - 138

Future Punishment. By H. H. Dobney, - - 12
Future States—Courtenay, 22, 35, 58, 77, 85, 100, 161
Frisbie, J. B. - - - - - - - - 151
Fall of Masada, - - - - - - - - 183

Gog and Magog—Russia, - - - - - - 175

Hand's Letter, - - - - - - - - 57

Is this Age Final, or Preparatory? - 70, 87, 102
Immortality—The True Wesleyan, 74, 81, 97, 113, 129, 145
Interesting Foreign Items, - - - - 80
Immateriality, by Theta, - - - - - 147
Infants—Soul and Body—True Wesleyan, - 151
Inquiry of Dr. Field, - - - - - 174

Jones, I. E.—The "Five Brethren," - - 185

Life in Christ. By Edward White, - - - 16
Letters of Encouragement, 80, 89, 110–112, 128, 136, 137, 144, 153, 159, 160, 176, 189, 192.

Moral Depravity—Original Sin, - - 54, 90
Misapprehensions Corrected: Letter to — & —, 105

Perfection of Adam, - - - - - - 25
Personal Reign of Christ—Jones, - - - 48
Protestantism in France, - - - - 63
Pledges to Examiner for 1850, - - 152, 176, 192

Questions of S. W. G. answered, - - - 124
Question and Answer, by Knight and Jackman, 71, 103, 158.
Question answered, - - - - - - - 112

Reason and its Use, - - - - - - 15
Reply to Dr. Lee's Suggestions, - - - 54
Resurrection, Importance of—Dobney, - - 94

Strange Things—Resolutions, - - - - 40
Strong Delusion, - - - - - - - 41
Symbols—their Interpretation—Hotchkiss, - 47
Strictures on Adoption—H. Grew, - - - 62
Scripture Psychology, - - - - - 83
Support for Examiner—Chittenden, - - - 89
Second Advent, - - - - - - - 89
Signs of the Times, - - 122, 141, 155, 171, 187
Sinners and the Atonement, - - - - 159
Son of God—H. Grew, - - - - - 177

The Ages, - - - - - - - 10, 33
The Future Age, - - - - - - - 32
The True Wesleyan, - - 41, 88, 104, 121
Truth Defended—Life in Christ—Edward White, 44
The Ante-Diluvian Earth, - - - - 53
Truth Advancing, - - - - - - 56
Tour East, with Observations, - - - 72
The True Wesleyan again, - - - - 170
Truth always in Harmony, - - - - 173
The Cross of Christ, - - - - - 159
The Woman in the Wilderness, - - - 182